arXiv:1207.5285v1 [math.AP] 23 Jul 2012

On the De Giorgi type conjecture for an elliptic system modeling phase separation

Kelei Wang [*]
Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430071, China
wangkelei@wipm.ac.cn

Abstract

In this paper we study the one dimensional symmetry problem of entire solutions to the problem

$$\Delta u = uv^2, \Delta v = vu^2, u, v > 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for all $n \geq 2$. We prove that, if a solution (u, v) is a local minimizer and has linear growth at infinity, then it is one dimensional, i.e. depending only on one variable. In the proof we also obtain the global Lipschitz continuity of solutions only under the linear growth assumption.

Keywords: elliptic systems, phase separation, one dimensional symmetry, sliding method.

AMS Subject Classification (2000): 35B06, 35B08, 35B25, 35J91.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the one dimensional symmetry problem for solutions of the following two component elliptic system in $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = uv^2, \\ \Delta v = vu^2. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

All of the solutions considered in this paper are positive classical solutions, that is, $u > 0$ and $v > 0$ and they are smooth.

We say a function u, defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$, is one dimensional if $u(x) \equiv f(x \cdot e)$ for a unit vector e and a function f defined on $\mathbb{R}^1$.

The system (1.1) arises from many fields in physics such as Bose-Einstein condensation and nonlinear optics. It is used to describe the "Phase Separation" phenomena. For more background, see [3, 8, 12, 14] and references therein.

---

[*] This work was done while the author was a postdoc at the University of Sydney and was supported by the Australian Research Council. I would like to thank Prof. E. N. Dancer for bringing this problem to me and Prof. S. Terracini and J. C. Wei for valuable discussions related to this problem.

In Berestycki-Lin-Wei-Zhao [3], inspired by the De Giorgi conjecture for the Allen-Cahn equation (cf. [13]), they ask whether there is one dimensional symmetry for entire solutions of (1.1). In [3] they proved the existence, symmetry and nondegeneracy of the solution to the one-dimensional problem

$$u'' = uv^2, v'' = vu^2, u, v > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.2}$$

In particular they showed that entire solutions of this problem are reflectionally symmetric, i.e., there exists x_0 such that $u(x - x_0) = v(x_0 - x)$. In [4], we also proved that, up to a scaling and translation, this entire solution is unique. This solution can be trivially extended to $\mathbb{R}^n$ for all $n \geq 2$, which gives a solution of (1.1) with linear growth. We note that, it was proved in [12] that the linear growth is the lowest possible for solutions to (1.1). More precisely, if there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$u(x) + v(x) \leq C(1 + |x|)^\alpha,$$

then $u, v \equiv 0$.

Unlike the Allen-Cahn equation, where minimal hypersurfaces play an important role in the limiting problem, the limiting problem of (1.1) is related to harmonic functions. One typical result is (cf. [8] and [14]), as $\kappa \to +\infty$, any sequence of uniformly bounded solutions (u_κ, v_κ) to the problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u_\kappa = \kappa u_\kappa v_\kappa^2, \\ \Delta v_\kappa = \kappa v_\kappa u_\kappa^2, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

converges uniformly (up to a subsequence of $\kappa \to +\infty$) to (w^+, w^-). Here w is a harmonic function and w^+ is its positive part, $w^- = (-w)^+$ the negative part.

Note that solutions of (1.3) are critical points of the energy functional (under suitable boundary conditions)

$$E_\kappa(u, v) := \int |\nabla u_\kappa|^2 + |\nabla v_\kappa|^2 + \kappa u_\kappa^2 v_\kappa^2. \tag{1.4}$$

For solutions of (1.1) with linear growth, by performing suitable blowing-down procedure (see Section 3 for details), the blowing down sequence converges to $((e \cdot x)^+, (e \cdot x)^-)$ for some constant vector e. This means that the level set of $u - v$ is asymptotically flat at infinity. Thus it is very natural to conjecture that these level sets are flat and the De Giorgi type conjecture holds under this linear growth condition.

In [3] and [4], there are some results in this direction when the space dimension $n = 2$. These works assume the solution satisfies a monotone condition or a stability condition. In [4], we also proved that, when $n = 2$, for every $d \geq 2$, there is a solution of (1.1), such that $u - v$ is asymptotic to $\mathrm{Re}(x + \sqrt{-1}y)^d$ (i.e. a homogeneous harmonic polynomial of degree d) at infinity. These examples show that we can not remove the linear growth assumption in the De Giorgi type conjecture.

In this paper we prove the following result for all $n \geq 2$.

Theorem 1.1. *If (u, v) is a local minimizer of the problem (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$u(x) + v(x) \leq C(1 + |x|), \tag{1.5}$$

then (u,v) *is one dimensional.*

Here a local minimizer means, for every smooth functions $(\bar{u},\bar{v})$ such that $(\bar{u},\bar{v})=(u,v)$ outside a ball $B_R(0)$, we have

$$\int_{B_R(0)}|\nabla u|^2+|\nabla v|^2+u^2v^2\leq\int_{B_R(0)}|\nabla\bar{u}|^2+|\nabla\bar{v}|^2+\bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2. \tag{1.6}$$

This is only a technical assumption and we believe it can be removed. In our proof, it is only used to compare the difference of energy between (u,v) and a harmonic replacement (see Proposition 6.6).

Let us explain briefly the strategy of the proof and the organization of the paper. In Section 2 we collect some useful results such as Almgren type monotonicity formula for solutions to (1.1). In Section 3 we perform a blowing down analysis and show that (u,v) are asymptotically flat at infinity.

Section 4 is devoted to the proof of an Alt-Caffarelli-Friedman monotonicity formula for solutions of (1.1) (see Theorem 4.3), which says

$$e^{-Cr^{-1/2}}r^{-4}\int_{B_r(0)}\frac{|\nabla u(y)|^2+u(y)^2v(y)^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy\int_{B_r(0)}\frac{|\nabla v(y)|^2+u(y)^2v(y)^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy$$

is non-decreasing in $r>1$. This needs a substantial improvement of the calculations in Noris-Tavares-Terracini-Verzini's proof of the Alt-Carrarelli-Friedman monotonicity formula in [12]. To achieve this we define a rearrangement for the two component functions (u,v) on the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. This allow us to reduce a minimization problem in higher dimensional sphere to a one dimension problem, where by the result in [3] we have better controls such as uniform Lipschitz continuity. (Note that at present the uniform Lipschitz continuity of solutions of (1.3) is only known when the space dimension $n=1$.) Similar ideas have already been used in [4] (see Theorem 4.6 therein).

This monotonicity formula can be used to give a lower bound of the growth rate of (u,v). For example, for a solution (u,v) with linear growth, using this monotonicity formula we can prove a nondegeneracy result (Corollary 4.5): there exists a constant C such that

$$\int_{B_R(0)}u+v\geq CR^{n+1}.$$

More importantly, this monotonicity formula and some of its consequences hold for all $x\in\{u=v\}$ with a universal constant C. This fact, combined with the results in Section 3, implies that at large scale (uniformly with respect to the base point $x\in\{u=v\}$), (u,v) is close to $((e\cdot x)^+,(e\cdot x)^-)$ for some unit vector e. This then enables us to prove the global Lipschitz continuity of u and v (see Theorem 5.1, the main result of Section 5).

In Section 6, we use the global Lipschitz property and the locally energy minimizing property of (u,v) to deduce the following crucial estimate

$$\int_{B_R(x)}|\nabla(u-v-\varphi)|^2\leq CR^{n-1/2},$$

where C is independent of x and R, and φ is the harmonic extension of $u-v$ from $\partial B_R(x)$ to $B_R(x)$. This is the only place where we need the energy minimizing property of (u,v).

The exponent $1/2$ in this estimate then implies the existence of a unique vector e such that for every $x_0\in\mathbb{R}^n$

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty}\frac{u(x_0+Rx)}{R}=(e\cdot x)^+,\ \lim_{R\to+\infty}\frac{v(x_0+Rx)}{R}=(e\cdot x)^-.$$

That is, the blowing down sequence has a unique limit. See Section 7.

After proving this, the situation is quite similar to the Gibbs conjecture studied in [2], that is, when $x_n\to\pm\infty$, we have some uniform convergence of (u,v). (However, here u and v are unbounded, which is different from [2].) In Section 8, we use the sliding method (in the spirit of [2]) to prove the existence of a cone of monotonicity for (u,v). That is, for every unit vector $\tau\in C(e_n,3/4)=\{\tau:\tau\cdot e_n\geq 3/4\}$,

$$\tau\cdot\nabla u\geq 0,\tau\cdot\nabla v\leq 0\quad\text{in}\quad\mathbb{R}^n.$$

The main idea is to propagate the good properties of u and v in the part far away from the transition part $\{u=v\}$ to the part near $\{u=v\}$. Similar ideas are used in Section 9 to enlarge the cone of monotonicity to a half space $C(e_n,0)$, which then implies our main result Theorem 1.1.

In the appendix we give a proof of a local interior version of the uniform Hölder estimate in [12].

In this paper we say a constant C is universal if it is independent of the base point $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and the radius R. It may be different from lines to lines.

2 Some preliminary results

In this section we recall some monotonicity formulas for solutions to (1.1). Then we will list some useful results, which will be used many times throughout this paper.

Proposition 2.1. *For $r>0$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$D(r;x):=r^{2-n}\int_{B_r(x)}|\nabla u|^2+|\nabla v|^2+u^2v^2$$

is nondecreasing in r.

For a proof, see [5] Lemma 2.1. In fact we have

$$\frac{d}{dr}D(r;x)=2r^{2-n}\int_{\partial B_r(x)}[u_r^2+v_r^2]+2r^{1-n}\int_{B_r(x)}u^2v^2. \tag{2.1}$$

Proposition 2.2. **(Almgren monotonicity formula.)** *For $r > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$N(r; x, u, v) := \frac{r \int_{B_r(x)} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 v^2}{\int_{\partial B_r(x)} u^2 + v^2}$$

is nondecreasing in r.

In this paper, we often omit u, v in $N(r; x, u, v)$ if no ambiguity occurs. We also denote it as $N(r)$ if $x = 0$. The following proof is taken from [4] (see also [3]).

Proof. For simplicity, take x to be the origin 0. Direct calculations show that for $H(r) := r^{1-n} \int_{\partial B_r} u^2 + v^2$,

$$\frac{d}{dr} H(r) = 2r^{1-n} \int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + 2u^2 v^2. \tag{2.2}$$

Combing this with (2.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dr} \frac{r^{2-n} \int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 v^2}{r^{1-n} \int_{\partial B_r} u^2 + v^2} \\
= \quad & \frac{H(r)[2r^{2-n} \int_{\partial B_r} (u_r^2 + v_r^2) + 2r^{1-n} \int_{B_r} u^2 v^2] - D(r)[2r^{1-n} \int_{\partial B_r} u u_r + v v_r]}{H(r)^2} \\
\geq \quad & \frac{H(r) 2r^{2-n} \int_{\partial B_r} (u_r^2 + v_r^2) - 2r^{3-2n} [\int_{\partial B_r} u u_r + v v_r]^2}{H(r)^2} \\
\geq \quad & 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the following fact

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 v^2 \leq \int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + 2u^2 v^2 = \int_{\partial B_r} u u_r + v v_r.$$

□

Proposition 2.3. *If $N(r_0; x) \geq d$, then for $r > r_0$,*

$$r^{1-n-2d} \int_{\partial B_r(x)} u^2 + v^2$$

is nondecreasing in r.

Proof. Direct calculation using (2.2) shows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dr} [r^{1-n-2d} \int_{\partial B_r(x)} u^2 + v^2] \\
= \quad & -2d r^{-n-2d} \int_{\partial B_r(x)} (u^2 + v^2) + 2r^{1-n-2d} \int_{B_r(x)} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + 2u^2 v^2 \\
\geq \quad & 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used Proposition 2.2, in particular, the fact that $N(r) \geq d$ for every $r \geq r_0$. □

The following result is Proposition 4.3 in [4].

Proposition 2.4. *Let* $R > 1$ *and let* (u, v) *be a solution of* (1.1) *on* B_R. *If* $N(R) \leq d$, *then for every* $1 < r_1 \leq r_2 \leq R$

$$\frac{H(r_2)}{H(r_1)} \leq e^d \frac{r_2^{2d}}{r_1^{2d}} \tag{2.3}$$

All of these results hold for solutions of (1.3) with $|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 v^2$ replaced by the corresponding energy density.

Next we list three useful results. The first one is Lemma 4.4 in [6].

Lemma 2.5. *If in the ball* $B_{2R}(0)$, $u \in C^2$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u \geq Mu, \\ u \geq 0, \\ u \leq A, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

then

$$\sup_{B_R(0)} u \leq C_1(n) A e^{-C_2(n) R M^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

where $C_1(n)$ *and* $C_2(n)$ *depend on the dimension* n *only.*

The next one is an interior version of the uniform Hölder estimate in [12].

Theorem 2.6. *Let* (u_κ, v_κ) *be a sequence of solutions of* (1.3) *in* $B_2(0)$. *Assume as* $\kappa \to +\infty$, u_κ *and* v_κ *are uniformly bounded, then for any* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, u_κ *and* v_κ *are uniformly bounded in* $C^\alpha(B_1(0))$.

The proof follows the blow up method in [12] and will be given in the appendix.

Finally we give a result about the limit of solutions of (1.3). This is the consequence of a combination of the main results in [8] and [14].

Theorem 2.7. *For every* $h > 0$, *there exists a* K, *if* (u_κ, v_κ) *is a solution of* (1.3) *in* $B_2(0)$, *with the parameter* $\kappa \geq K$, *and satisfies*

1. $u_\kappa(0) = v_\kappa(0)$;
2. $\int_{\partial B_1(0)} u_\kappa^2 + v_\kappa^2 = \int_{\partial B_1(0)} x_1^2$;
3. $$N(2; 0, u_\kappa, v_\kappa) = \frac{2\int_{B_2(0)} |\nabla u_\kappa|^2 + |\nabla v_\kappa|^2 + \kappa u_\kappa^2 v_\kappa^2}{\int_{\partial B_2(0)} u_\kappa^2 + v_\kappa^2} \leq 1,$$

then there exists a unit vector e *such that*

$$\sup_{B_1(0)} |u_\kappa - (e \cdot x)^+| + |v_\kappa - (e \cdot x)^-| \leq h.$$

Proof. Assume there exists a sequence of (u_κ, v_κ) satisfying the assumptions but for every unit vector e,

$$\sup_{B_1(0)} |u_\kappa - (e\cdot x)^+| + |v_\kappa - (e\cdot x)^-| \geq h. \tag{2.5}$$

By Proposition 2.4, there is a universal constant C such that

$$\int_{\partial B_2(0)} u_\kappa^2 + v_\kappa^2 \leq C.$$

Because u_κ and v_κ are subharmonic functions, they are uniformly bounded in $B_{3/2}(0)$. By Theorem 2.6, they are also uniformly bounded in $C^\alpha(B_{4/3}(0))$ for every $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Choosing a subsequence of (u_κ, v_κ) such that they converge to (u_∞, v_∞) uniformly in $B_1(0)$.

By the main result of [8] and [14], $u_\infty - v_\infty$ is a harmonic function. They satisfy

1. $u_\infty v_\infty \equiv 0$;
2. $u_\infty(0) = v_\infty(0)$;
3. $\int_{\partial B_1(0)} u_\infty^2 + v_\infty^2 = \int_{\partial B_1(0)} x_1^2$;
4. $$\frac{\int_{B_1(0)} |\nabla u_\infty|^2 + |\nabla v_\infty|^2}{\int_{\partial B_1(0)} u_\infty^2 + v_\infty^2} = \lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} N(1;0,u_\kappa,v_\kappa) \leq 1.$$

Because $u_\infty(0) = v_\infty(0) = 0$, for any $r \in (0,1)$

$$N_\infty(r;0,u_\infty,v_\infty) \geq \lim_{r\to 0} N_\infty(r;0,u_\infty,v_\infty) = \deg(u_\infty - v_\infty, 0) \geq 1.$$

In the above, $\deg(u_\infty - v_\infty, 0)$ is the degree of the harmonic function $u_\infty - v_\infty$ at 0. By the Almgren monotonicity formula for harmonic functions, $N_\infty(r;0,u_\infty,v_\infty) = 1$ for every $r \in (0,1)$. This implies $u_\infty - v_\infty = e\cdot x$ for some unit vector e. (This characterization is well known, for a proof and some generalizations see Proposition 3.9 in [12].) This is a contradiction, so the assumption (2.5) does not hold. $\square$

3 The blowing down sequence

In this section, (u, v) denotes a solution to (1.1) satisfying the linear growth condition (1.5).

For every $R \geq 1$, denote

$$L(R)^2 := R^{1-n} \int_{\partial B_R(0)} u^2 + v^2,$$

and define the blowing down sequence

$$u^R(x) := \frac{1}{L(R)} u(Rx), \ \ v^R(x) := \frac{1}{L(R)} v(Rx).$$

Remark 3.1. *By (1.5), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$L(R) \leq CR.$$

On the other hand, by the Liouville type result (c.f. Proposition 2.7 in [12]), $\forall \alpha \in (0,1)$, $\exists C_\alpha > 0$ such that

$$L(R) \geq C_\alpha R^\alpha.$$

By the definition, we have the normalized condition

$$\int_{\partial B_1(0)} (u^R)^2 + (v^R)^2 = 1. \tag{3.1}$$

u^R and v^R satisfy (1.3) with $\kappa(R) = L(R)^2 R^2$. Note that as $R \to +\infty$, $\kappa(R) \to +\infty$.

Lemma 3.2. *$\exists R_j \to +\infty$, such that $L(\frac{R_j}{2}) \geq \frac{1}{3} L(R_j)$.*

Proof. Assume by the contrary, $\exists R_0 > 0$ such that, $\forall R \geq R_0$

$$L(R) \leq \frac{1}{3} L(2R).$$

An iteration implies, $\forall k > 0$

$$L(2^k R_0) \geq 3^k L(R_0).$$

On the other hand, by (1.5), we also have

$$L(2^k R_0) \leq C 2^k.$$

This is a contradiction for k large. $\square$

As a consequence, if we choose $R = R_j$ in the definition of u^R and v^R (simply denoted as u_j, v_j, and $\kappa_j = \kappa(R_j)$), we have

$$\int_{\partial B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)} u_j^2 + v_j^2 \geq \frac{1}{3}. \tag{3.2}$$

Because u_j and v_j are subharmonic, we can get a uniform upper bound of u_j and v_j on any compact set of $B_1(0)$. Then by Theorem 2.6, u_j and v_j are uniformly bounded in $C^\alpha(B_{1-\varepsilon}(0))$ for every $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Hence we can extract a subsequence of j (still denoted by j), such that (u_j, v_j) converges to (u_∞, v_∞) uniformly on any compact set of $B_1(0)$. By the main result of [8] and [14], (u_∞, v_∞) satisfies

$$\Delta(u_\infty - v_\infty) = 0.$$

(3.2) can be passed to the limit, which implies that (u_∞, v_∞) is nontrivial. In fact, because

$$u_\infty(0) + v_\infty(0) = \lim_{j \to +\infty} u_j(0) + v_j(0) = \lim_{j \to +\infty} \frac{u(0) + v(0)}{L_j} = 0,$$

both u_∞ and v_∞ are nontrivial. [1]

---

[1] Otherwise, for example, if $v_\infty \equiv 0$, then u_∞ is nonnegative and harmonic. Combining the fact that $u_\infty(0) = 0$ with the strong maximum principle, we see $u_\infty \equiv 0$.

Proposition 3.3. *$u_\infty - v_\infty$ is linear. That is, there is a constant $c(n) > 0$ depending on the dimension n only, such that, under suitable coordinates,*

$$u_\infty = c(n)x_1^+, v_\infty = c(n)x_1^-.$$

Proof. By rescaling the monotonicity formula in Proposition 2.2, we get a similar one for (u_j, v_j). That is, for $r > 0$ and $B_r(x) \subset B_1(0)$,

$$\frac{r\int_{B_r(x)} |\nabla u_j|^2 + |\nabla v_j|^2 + \kappa_j u_j^2 v_j^2}{\int_{\partial B_r(x)} u_j^2 + v_j^2}$$

is nondecreasing in r. We can prove that (c.f. Theorem 1.4 in [12] and Corollary 2.4 in [5])

$$u_j \to u_\infty, v_j \to v_\infty \text{ strongly in } H^1_{loc}(B_1(0)),$$
$$\kappa_j u_j^2 v_j^2 \to 0, \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(B_1(0)).$$

So for every $B_r(x) \subset\subset B_1(0)$, we have

$$N_\infty(r; x, u_\infty, v_\infty) := \frac{r\int_{B_r(x)} |\nabla u_\infty|^2 + |\nabla v_\infty|^2}{\int_{\partial B_r(x)} u_j^2 + v_j^2} = \lim_{j\to+\infty} \frac{r\int_{B_r(x)} |\nabla u_j|^2 + |\nabla v_j|^2 + \kappa_j u_j^2 v_j^2}{\int_{\partial B_r(x)} u_j^2 + v_j^2}$$

is nondecreasing in r, too. Of course, this fact is nothing else but the Almgren monotonicity formula for harmonic functions.

Because $u_\infty(0) = v_\infty(0) = 0$, we have for $\forall r > 0$

$$N_\infty(r; 0, u_\infty, v_\infty) \geq \lim_{r\to 0} N_\infty(r; 0, u_\infty, v_\infty) = \deg(u_\infty - v_\infty, 0) \geq 1.$$

In the above, $\deg(u_\infty - v_\infty, 0)$ is the degree of the harmonic function $u_\infty - v_\infty$ at 0. We claim that $N_\infty(r; 0, u_\infty, v_\infty) = 1$ for $\forall r \in (0, 1)$. If this is true, then by the characterization of linear function using the Almgren monotonicity formula (see for example Proposition 3.9 in [12]), we can finish the proof of this proposition.

Assume by the contrary, $\exists r_0 \in (0, 1)$, such that $N_\infty(r_0) = 1 + 2\delta$ with $\delta > 0$. Then for j large,

$$\frac{r_0\int_{B_{r_0}(0)} |\nabla u_j|^2 + |\nabla v_j|^2 + \kappa_j u_j^2 v_j^2}{\int_{\partial B_{r_0}(0)} u_j^2 + v_j^2} \geq 1 + \delta.$$

Rescaling back and using Proposition 2.2, we know that for r large enough,

$$\frac{r\int_{B_r(0)} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 v^2}{\int_{\partial B_r(0)} u^2 + v^2} \geq 1 + \delta.$$

By Proposition 2.3, for $r > 0$ large enough

$$r^{1-n-2(1+\delta)} \int_{\partial B_r(0)} u^2 + v^2$$

is nondecreasing in r. This contradicts the linear growth condition (1.5) and the claim is proven. $\square$

Note that the above blowing down procedure can be performed at any base point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus we get

Corollary 3.4. *Let (u, v) be a solution of (1.1) satisfying the linear growth condition (1.5). Then for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, $N(r; x) \leq 1$.*

Remark 3.5. *The blowing down analysis in this section can be preformed for solutions of (1.1) with polynomial growth. In fact, we can show that any solution with polynomial growth satisfies*

$$\lim_{r \to +\infty} N(r) < +\infty.$$

This was studied in [4].

4 An Alt-Caffarelli-Friedman monotonicity formula

In [12], S. Terracini etc. proved an Alt-Caffarelli-Friedman type monotonicity for solutions of (1.1). In this section we improve their result and establish a sharp form of the Alt-Caffarelli-Friedman type monotonicity formula (see Theorem 4.3).

4.1 The proof

Before going into the proof, we introduce a useful tool. Fix the polar coordinates on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ as $(\cos\alpha, \sin\alpha\cos\alpha_2, \sin\alpha_1\sin\alpha\cdots\sin\alpha_{n-1})$ for $\alpha \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ and $\alpha_i \in (0, 2\pi)$, $2 \leq i \leq n-1$. Let $\bar{u}, \bar{v}$ be two nonnegative functions in $L^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, their rearrangements are two functions $\bar{u}^*, \bar{v}^*$ satisfying

1. they depend on α only;
2. $\bar{u}^*$ is non-increasing in α and $\bar{v}^*$ is non-decreasing in α;
3. for every $t > 0, |\{\bar{u} > t\}| = |\{\bar{u}^* > t\}|, |\{\bar{v} > t\}| = |\{\bar{v}^* > t\}|$. Here $|A|$ denotes the area measure of $A \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

We know if $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, then $\bar{u}^*, \bar{v}^* \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ (see [9]) and

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}^*|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}|^2, \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}^*|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}|^2. \tag{4.1}$$

Note that in our definition we make these two functions as separated as possible. More precisely we have

Lemma 4.1. *If $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ are nonnegative and $\bar{u}^*, \bar{v}^*$ are defined as above, then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}^* \bar{v}^* \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}\bar{v}.$$

Proof. By Fubini theorem,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}\bar{v} = \int_0^{+\infty}\int_0^{+\infty} |\{\bar{u} > t\} \cap \{\bar{v} > s\}| dt ds.$$

So we only need to prove for every $t, s \in (0, +\infty)$,

$$|\{\bar{u} > t\} \cap \{\bar{v} > s\}| \geq |\{\bar{u}^* > t\} \cap \{\bar{v}^* > s\}|.$$

That is, for every two measurable sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, let A^*, B^* be the rearrangement defined above. Then

$$|A \cap B| \geq |A^* \cap B^*|.$$

First we note that this inequality is trivial if $|A^* \cap B^*| = 0$. Next if $|A^* \cap B^*| > 0$, by noting that they are spherical caps with opposite centers, we must have $A^* \cup B^* = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and trivially we have $|A \cup B| \leq |A^* \cup B^*|$. Combing this with the definition of the rearrangement we get

$$|A \cap B| = |A| + |B| - |A \cup B| \geq |A^*| + |B^*| - |A^* \cup B^*| = |A^* \cap B^*|.$$

This finishes the proof. □

In the following we denote, for $x \geq 0$,

$$\gamma(x) = \sqrt{(\frac{n-2}{2})^2 + x} - \frac{n-2}{2}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *For every $\lambda \geq 1$, there exists a positive constant C, which depends only on the dimension n and λ, such that for every $\kappa \geq 1$ and $\bar{u}_\kappa, \bar{v}_\kappa \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ satisfying*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}_\kappa^2 = 1, \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{v}_\kappa^2 = \lambda^2,$$

then

$$\gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa|^2 + \kappa \bar{u}_\kappa^2 \bar{v}_\kappa^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}_\kappa^2}) + \gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}_\kappa|^2 + \kappa \bar{u}_\kappa^2 \bar{v}_\kappa^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{v}_\kappa^2}) \geq 2 - C\kappa^{-1/4}.$$

Proof. We divide the proof into three steps. The second step is not so necessary for the proof. We include it here only to make the picture more clear.

Step 1. We will consider the constraint minimization problem

$$\min \gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}|^2 + \kappa \bar{u}^2 \bar{v}^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}^2}) + \gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}|^2 + \kappa \bar{u}^2 \bar{v}^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{v}^2}),$$

for $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}^2 = 1, \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{v}^2 = \lambda^2.$$

After replacing $\bar{v}$ by $\lambda^{-1}\bar{v}$, we are led to consider a new minimization problem

$$\min \gamma(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}|^2 + \kappa\lambda^2\bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2) + \gamma(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}|^2 + \kappa\bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2),$$

for $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{v}^2 = 1.$$

Direct method shows that the minimizer to this minimization problem, $(\bar{u}_\kappa, \bar{v}_\kappa)$, exists. Denote

$$x_\kappa = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa|^2 + \kappa\lambda^2\bar{u}_\kappa^2\bar{v}_\kappa^2, \quad y_\kappa = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}_\kappa|^2 + \kappa\bar{u}_\kappa^2\bar{v}_\kappa^2.$$

There exist two Lagrange multipliers $\lambda_{1,\kappa}$ and $\lambda_{2,\kappa}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa + [\lambda^2 + \dfrac{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}{\gamma'(x_\kappa)}]\kappa\bar{u}_\kappa\bar{v}_\kappa^2 = \dfrac{\lambda_{1,\kappa}}{\gamma'(x_\kappa)}\bar{u}_\kappa, \\ -\Delta_\theta \bar{v}_\kappa + [1 + \dfrac{\lambda^2\gamma'(x_\kappa)}{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}]\kappa\bar{v}_\kappa\bar{u}_\kappa^2 = \dfrac{\lambda_{2,\kappa}}{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}\bar{v}_\kappa. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 4.1, we can assume that $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$ depend only on α, and one is nonincreasing in α, the other one nondecreasing in α.

By choosing a test function of the form (ϕ^+, ϕ^-), where ϕ is an eigenfunction of $-\Delta_\theta$ with eigenvalue $n-1$ and $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \phi^2 = 2$, we can get the bound

$$\gamma(x_\kappa) + \gamma(y_\kappa) \leq 2. \tag{4.2}$$

Hence $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$ are uniformly bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Multiplying the equations by $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$ respectively and integrating by parts, we get

$$\begin{cases} x_\kappa + \dfrac{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}{\gamma'(x_\kappa)} \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \kappa\bar{u}_\kappa^2\bar{v}_\kappa^2 = \dfrac{\lambda_{1,\kappa}}{\gamma'(x_\kappa)}, \\ y_\kappa + \dfrac{\lambda^2\gamma'(x_\kappa)}{\gamma'(y_\kappa)} \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \kappa\bar{u}_\kappa^2\bar{v}_\kappa^2 = \dfrac{\lambda_{2,\kappa}}{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

In particular, $\lambda_{1,\kappa}$ and $\lambda_{2,\kappa}$ are positive and uniformly bounded.

Step 2. Choosing

$$\xi_\kappa = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2 + \frac{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}{\gamma'(x_\kappa)}}{1 + \frac{\lambda^2\gamma'(x_\kappa)}{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}}}$$

and let

$$\hat{u}_\kappa := \bar{u}_\kappa, \hat{v}_\kappa := \xi_\kappa\bar{v}_\kappa,$$

we have

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_\theta \hat{u}_\kappa + \hat{\kappa}\hat{u}_\kappa \hat{v}_\kappa^2 = \hat{\lambda}_{1,\kappa}\hat{u}_\kappa, \\ -\Delta_\theta \hat{v}_\kappa + \hat{\kappa}\hat{v}_\kappa \hat{u}_\kappa^2 = \hat{\lambda}_{2,\kappa}\hat{v}_\kappa. \end{cases}$$

Here

$$\hat{\kappa} = \kappa[1 + \frac{\lambda^2\gamma'(x_\kappa)}{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}], \hat{\lambda}_{1,\kappa} = \frac{\lambda_{1,\kappa}}{\gamma'(x_\kappa)}, \hat{\lambda}_{2,\kappa} = \frac{\lambda_{2,\kappa}}{\gamma'(y_\kappa)}.$$

As $\kappa \to +\infty$, $\hat{\kappa} \to +\infty$. Without loss of generality we can assume that there exist nonnegative constants ξ_∞, $\hat{\lambda}_{1,\infty}$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{2,\infty}$ such that

$$\lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \xi_\kappa = \xi_\infty, \lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \hat{\lambda}_{1,\kappa} = \hat{\lambda}_{1,\infty}, \lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \hat{\lambda}_{2,\kappa} = \hat{\lambda}_{2,\infty}.$$

We can also get a uniform upper bound of $\hat{u}_\kappa$ and $\hat{v}_\kappa$ by the Moser iteration, using the uniform $H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ bound on $\hat{u}_\kappa$ and $\hat{v}_\kappa$ and the elliptic inequalities

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_\theta \hat{u}_\kappa \leq \hat{\lambda}_{1,\kappa}\hat{u}_\kappa, \\ -\Delta_\theta \hat{v}_\kappa \leq \hat{\lambda}_{2,\kappa}\hat{v}_\kappa. \end{cases}$$

Similar to Theorem 2.7, there is a solution of

$$-\Delta_\theta w = \hat{\lambda}_{1,\infty} w^+ - \hat{\lambda}_{2,\infty} w^-$$

such that $\hat{u}_\kappa \to w^+$, $\hat{v}_\kappa \to w^-$ in $C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \hat{\kappa}\hat{u}_\kappa^2 \hat{v}_\kappa^2 = 0.$$

This implies

$$\lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \kappa\bar{u}_\kappa^2 \bar{v}_\kappa^2 = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (w^+)^2 = \lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \hat{u}_\kappa^2 = 1, \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (w^-)^2 = \lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \hat{v}_\kappa^2 = \xi_\infty^2.$$

So, with the help of (4.4) we get

$$\lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa|^2 + \kappa\lambda_\kappa^2 \bar{u}_\kappa^2 \bar{v}_\kappa^2 = \lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \hat{u}_\kappa|^2 + \hat{\kappa}\hat{u}_\kappa^2 \hat{v}_\kappa^2 = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta w^+|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (w^+)^2}.$$

$$\lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}_\kappa|^2 + \kappa\bar{u}_\kappa^2 \bar{v}_\kappa^2 = \lim_{\kappa\to+\infty} \xi_\kappa^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \hat{v}_\kappa|^2 + \hat{\kappa}\hat{u}_\kappa^2 \hat{v}_\kappa^2 = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta w^-|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (w^-)^2}.$$

Letting $\kappa \to +\infty$ in (4.2), we get

$$\gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta w^+|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (w^+)^2}) + \gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta w^-|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (w^-)^2}) \leq 2.$$

By [1] (see also [9] and [11]),

$$\min_{w \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta w^+|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (w^+)^2}) + \gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta w^-|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (w^-)^2}) = 2. \tag{4.5}$$

So the above inequality must be an equality and $\lambda_{1,\infty} = \lambda_{2,\infty} = n-1$ and w is an eigenfunction with eigenvalue $n-1$. Then by (4.3),

$$\lim_{\kappa \to +\infty} x_\kappa = \lim_{\kappa \to +\infty} y_\kappa = n-1.$$

By the definition of ξ_κ we get

$$\lim_{\kappa \to +\infty} \xi_\kappa = 1.$$

In conclusion, $\bar{u}_\kappa \to w^+$, $\bar{v}_\kappa \to w^-$ in $C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. By the symmetry of $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$, there exists a constant $c(n)$ such that

$$w = c(n) \cos \alpha.$$

Step 3. Because $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$ depend on α only, they in fact satisfy a system of ODEs. By suitably modifying the argument in [3], we can prove the uniform Lipschitz continuity of $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$. Moreover, there exists a constant C such that for all κ,

$$\bar{u}_\kappa \bar{v}_\kappa \leq C^2 \kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.6}$$

So for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, either $\bar{u}_\kappa(\theta)$ or $\bar{v}_\kappa(\theta)$ is less than $C\kappa^{-1/4}$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \kappa \bar{u}_\kappa^2 \bar{v}_\kappa^2 \leq C\kappa^{-1/4} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \kappa \bar{u}_\kappa \bar{v}_\kappa^2 + \kappa \bar{v}_\kappa \bar{u}_\kappa^2 \leq C\kappa^{-1/4}. \tag{4.7}$$

Take $f_\kappa = (\bar{u}_\kappa - \bar{v}_\kappa)^+$, $g_\kappa = (\bar{u}_\kappa - \bar{v}_\kappa)^-$. First by (4.6) we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |f_\kappa - \bar{u}_\kappa|^2 \leq \int_{\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}} \bar{v}_\kappa^2 + \int_{\{\bar{u}_\kappa < \bar{v}_\kappa\}} \bar{u}_\kappa^2 \leq C\kappa^{-1/2}. \tag{4.8}$$

The same estimate holds for $g_\kappa - \bar{v}_\kappa$.

Next we estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta f_\kappa|^2 = \int_{\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa|^2 + |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}_\kappa|^2 - 2\nabla_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa \cdot \nabla_\theta \bar{v}_\kappa.$$

By the symmetry and monotonicity of $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$, $\partial\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}$ is a smooth hypersurface (i.e. a circle). So by the uniform Lipschitz continuity of $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and (4.6), we get

$$|\int_{\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}} \nabla_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa \cdot \nabla_\theta \bar{v}_\kappa| \quad = \quad |\int_{\partial\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_\kappa}{\partial \nu} \bar{v}_\kappa - \int_{\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}} \bar{v}_\kappa \Delta_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \int_{\partial\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}} C\kappa^{-1/4} + C\kappa^{-1/4}\int_{\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}} \Delta_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa \\ &\leq C\kappa^{-1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we get

$$\int_{\{\bar{u}_\kappa > \bar{v}_\kappa\}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}_\kappa|^2 \leq C\kappa^{-1/4}.$$

Combing these with (4.7), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta f_\kappa|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}_\kappa|^2 + \kappa\lambda_\kappa^2 \bar{u}_\kappa^2 \bar{v}_\kappa^2 + C\kappa^{-1/4}. \tag{4.9}$$

We can also get similar estimates for $\bar{v}_\kappa$.

Noting (4.8) and (4.5), we get

$$2 \leq \gamma\left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta f_\kappa|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f_\kappa^2}\right) + \gamma\left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta g_\kappa|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} g_\kappa^2}\right) \leq \gamma(x_\kappa) + \gamma(y_\kappa) + C\kappa^{-1/4}.$$

This is nothing else but a reformulation of the claim in this lemma. □

Now we can state the Alt-Caffarelli-Friedman monotonicity formula. In the following we denote

$$J(r;x) = r^{-4}\int_{B_r(x)} \frac{|\nabla u(y)|^2 + u(y)^2 v(y)^2}{|x-y|^{n-2}} dy \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{|\nabla v(y)|^2 + u(y)^2 v(y)^2}{|x-y|^{n-2}} dy.$$

If $x = 0$, we simply write this as $J(r)$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let (u, v) be a solution of (1.1). There exists a positive constant C, such that for every $r > 1$,*

$$e^{-Cr^{-1/2}} J(r)$$

is nondecreasing in r.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 2.5 in [12], we have

$$\frac{d}{dr}\log J(r) \geq -\frac{4}{r} + \frac{2}{r}\left[\gamma\left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{u}|^2 + r^2\bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u}^2}\right) + \gamma\left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla_\theta \bar{v}|^2 + r^2\bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{v}^2}\right)\right], \tag{4.10}$$

where

$$\bar{u} = u(r\theta), \bar{v} = v(r\theta).$$

Because u and v are subharmonic, by the mean value inequality we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{u} = \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|}\int_{\partial B_r(0)} u \geq u(0), \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \bar{v} = \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|}\int_{\partial B_r(0)} v \geq v(0).$$

By Proposition 3.3, we have

$$\lim_{r\to+\infty}\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\bar{u}^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\bar{v}^2}=1.$$

After a normalization in $L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ we can apply the previous lemma to deduce that

$$\gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}|\nabla_\theta\bar{u}|^2+r^2\bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\bar{u}^2})+\gamma(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}|\nabla_\theta\bar{v}|^2+r^2\bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\bar{v}^2})\geq 2-Cr^{-1/2}.$$

Substituting this into (4.10) we get for all r large

$$\frac{d}{dr}\log J(r)\geq -Cr^{-1-1/2}.$$

By taking a larger constant C, we know for all $r\geq 1$, $\log J(r)-Cr^{-1/2}$ is nondecreasing in r. This finishes the proof. □

4.2 Some consequences

Proposition 4.4. *For a solution (u,v) of (1.1) having a linear growth at infinity, there exists a constant C, such that for every $r>1$,*

$$\frac{1}{C}\leq J(r)\leq C.$$

Moreover, the limit $\lim_{r\to+\infty}J(r)\in(0,+\infty)$ exists.

Proof. The lower bound is guaranteed by the almost monotonicity of $J(r)$. The upper bound can be obtained by combining the linear growth condition with the following estimate

$$r^{-2}\int_{B_r(0)}\frac{|\nabla u(y)|^2+u(y)^2v(y)^2}{|y|^{n-2}}\leq Cr^{-n-2}\int_{B_{2r}}u^2. \tag{4.11}$$

This is because for every $\eta\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int\frac{|\nabla u(y)|^2+u(y)^2v(y)^2}{|y|^{n-2}}\eta(y)^2dy &= \int\Delta\frac{u(y)^2}{2}|y|^{2-n}\eta(y)^2dy\\ &= \int\frac{u(y)^2}{2}\Delta(|y|^{2-n}\eta(y)^2)dy\\ &\leq \int\frac{u(y)^2}{2}[2\nabla|y|^{2-n}\cdot\nabla\eta(y)^2+|y|^{2-n}\Delta\eta(y)^2]dy.\end{aligned}$$

By choosing $\eta\equiv 1$ in $B_r(0)$, $\eta\equiv 0$ outside $B_{2r}(0)$ and $|\nabla\eta|^2+|\Delta\eta|\leq\frac{16}{r^2}$ we get (4.11).

Finally, it is clear that

$$\lim_{r\to+\infty}J(r)=\lim_{r\to+\infty}e^{-Cr^{-\frac{1}{2}}}J(r)\in(\frac{1}{C},C).$$

□

This implies a nondegeneracy condition.

Corollary 4.5. *For a solution* (u, v) *of* (1.1) *having a linear growth at infinity, there exists a constant* C*, such that for all* $r > 1$*,*

$$\int_{\partial B_r(0)} u + v \geq C r^n.$$

Proof. If there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\partial B_r(0)} u + v \leq \varepsilon r^n,$$

then because u and v are subharmonic,

$$\sup_{B_{r/2}(0)} u + v \leq C\varepsilon r.$$

Using (4.11) we get

$$J(r/4) \leq C\varepsilon^2.$$

For ε sufficiently small, this contradicts Proposition 4.4 and is impossible. $\square$

Remark 4.6. *Combining this with the results in Section 3, we know for every* $R_j \to +\infty$*, up to a subsequence of* j*, there exists a vector* e *such that on any compact set of* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, there is the uniform convergence*

$$u_j(x) = \frac{1}{R_j} u(R_j x) \to (e \cdot x)^+, v_j(x) = \frac{1}{R_j} v(R_j x) \to (e \cdot x)^-.$$

Note that J *is invariant under such a scaling. By Proposition* 3.3

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j\to+\infty} J(R_j) &= \lim_{j\to+\infty} \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{|\nabla u_j(y)|^2 + R_j^4 u_j(y)^2 v_j(y)^2}{|y|^{n-2}} \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{|\nabla v_j(y)|^2 + R_j^4 u_j(y)^2 v_j(y)^2}{|y|^{n-2}} \\ &= c(n)|e|^2. \end{aligned}$$

After a scaling of the form $(u(x), v(x)) \to (\lambda u(\lambda x), \lambda v(\lambda x))$ *for some* $\lambda > 0$*, we can assume* $|e| = 1$*. However, at this stage we do not know whether such* e *is unique. It may depend on the sequence* R_j*.*

Lemma 4.7. *There exists a universal constant* C *such that for every* $x \in \{u = v\}$*,*

$$\int_{B_1(x)} u^2 \geq C \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_1(x)} v^2 \geq C.$$

Proof. Assume by the contrary, there exists a sequence of $x_i \in \{u = v\}$ such that

$$\lim_{i\to+\infty} \int_{B_1(x_i)} u^2 = 0.$$

We claim that

$$\lim_{i\to+\infty} \int_{B_1(x_i)} v^2 = 0.$$

Otherwise there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{i\to+\infty} \int_{B_1(x_i)} v^2 \geq \delta^2.$$

Consider

$$u_i(x) = \frac{1}{L_i} u(x_i + x), v_i(x) = \frac{1}{L_i} v(x_i + x)$$

where $L_i \geq \delta$ is chosen so that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} u_i^2 + v_i^2 = 1. \tag{4.12}$$

(u_i, v_i) satisfies (1.3) with $\kappa = L_i^2 \geq \delta^2$. By scaling the doubling property Proposition 2.4, we obtain

$$\int_{B_2(0)} u_i^2 + v_i^2 \leq 64 \cdot 2^n.$$

Exactly as in Section 3, we know u_i and v_i are uniformly bounded and uniformly 1/2-Hölder continuous in $B_{3/2}(0)$. Assume their limits (of a subsequence) are u_∞ and v_∞. Then

$$\int_{B_1(0)} u_\infty^2 = 0, \int_{B_1(0)} v_\infty^2 = 1.$$

So $u_\infty \equiv 0$.

Since $x_i \in \{u = v\}$,

$$u_\infty(0) - v_\infty(0) = \lim_{i\to+\infty} u_i(0) - v_i(0) = 0.$$

We know v_∞ is a nonnegative harmonic function. [2] Because $v_\infty(0) = 0$, by the strong maximum principle, $v_\infty \equiv 0$. This contradicts (4.12) and we prove the claim.

Now we use Corollary 4.5 and Proposition 2.4 to get, for $r \gg |x_i|$

$$\begin{aligned} Cr^{n+2} &\leq \int_{B_r(0)} u^2 + v^2 \\ &\leq \int_{B_{r+|x_i|}(x_i)} u^2 + v^2 \end{aligned}$$

---

[2] There are two cases: if L_i are uniformly bounded, this comes directly from the equations (1.3) and the fact that $u_\infty \equiv 0$, and if $L_i \to +\infty$, this can be deduced from Theorem 2.7.

$$\leq \quad Cr^{n+2}\int_{B_1(x_i)} u^2+v^2 = o(r^{n+2}).$$

Thus for i large we get a contradiction. That is, our assumption at the beginning of the proof is not true. $\square$

Repeating the proof of Theorem 4.3 we get

Corollary 4.8. *There is a universal constant C, such that for every $x \in \{u = v\}$ and $r > 1$, $e^{-Cr^{-1/2}}J(r;x)$ is nondecreasing in r.*

Corollary 4.9. *There exists a constant C such that for every $x \in \{u = v\}$ and $r \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq J(r;x) \leq C.$$

Proof. Assume $\sup_{B_r(0)} u+v \leq Cr$. Then for any fixed x, if r is large (depending on $|x|$),

$$\sup_{B_r(x)} u+v \leq 2Cr.$$

Combining this with (4.11), we can obtain an upper bound of $J(r;x)$. By the almost monotonicity of $J(r;x)$ (Corollary 4.8), this gives an upper bound of $J(r;x)$ for all $x \in \{u=v\}$ and $r \geq 1$.

Concerning the lower bound, by the almost monotonicity of $J(r;x)$, we only need to consider $J(1;x)$. Assume by the contrary, there exist $x_i \in \{u = v\}$ such that $\lim_{i\to+\infty} J(1;x_i) = 0$. Define (u_i, v_i) as in the proof of Lemma 4.7. In particular, (u_i, v_i) satisfies the normalized condition (4.12). Then

$$J(1;x_i) = L_i^4 \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{|\nabla u_i|^2 + L_i^2 u_i^2 v_i^2}{|y|^{n-2}} dy \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{|\nabla v_i|^2 + L_i^2 u_i^2 v_i^2}{|y|^{n-2}} dy.$$

Note that L_i^2 is the parameter in the equations of u_i and v_i.

If L_i are bounded, after passing to a subsequence, assume $\lim_{i\to+\infty} L_i = L_\infty$. Then by the proof of Lemma 4.7, (u_i, v_i) converges to (u_∞, v_∞) uniformly on any compact set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. (u_∞, v_∞) satisfies (1.3) with $\kappa = L_\infty^2$. By passing to the limit in $J(1;x_i)$ we get

$$\int_{B_1(0)} \frac{|\nabla u_\infty|^2 + L_\infty^2 u_\infty^2 v_\infty^2}{|y|^{n-2}} dy \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{|\nabla v_\infty|^2 + L_\infty^2 u_\infty^2 v_\infty^2}{|y|^{n-2}} dy = 0.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume the first integral is 0. Hence u_∞ is a constant function. Moreover, if $v_\infty \neq 0$, $u_\infty \equiv 0$. Using the equations of u_∞ and v_∞ and noting that $u_\infty(0) = v_\infty(0)$, we see both cases imply $u_\infty \equiv v_\infty \equiv 0$. This contradicts the normalization condition (4.12).

If L_i are unbounded, by Theorem 2.7, there exists a unit vector e such that (u_i, v_i) converges to $(u_\infty, v_\infty) = ((e\cdot x)^+, (e\cdot x)^-)$ uniformly on any compact set of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In this case, we still have the convergence

$$\lim_{\kappa\to+\infty}\int_{B_1(0)}\frac{|\nabla u_i|^2+L_i^2u_i^2v_i^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy=\int_{B_1(0)}\frac{|\nabla u_\infty|^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy. \tag{4.13}$$

This is because, for every $\varepsilon>0$, by the strong convergence of u_i in H^1_{loc},

$$\lim_{\kappa\to+\infty}\int_{B_1(0)\setminus B_\varepsilon(0)}\frac{|\nabla u_i|^2+L_i^2u_i^2v_i^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy=\int_{B_1(0)\setminus B_\varepsilon(0)}\frac{|\nabla u_\infty|^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy,$$

and by (4.11) and the uniform Hölder continuity of u_i, as $i\to+\infty$ and $\varepsilon\to0$,

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(0)}\frac{|\nabla u_i|^2+L_i^2u_i^2v_i^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy\le C\varepsilon^{-n}\int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(0)}u_i^2\le C(u_i(0)^2+\varepsilon^{1/2})\to0.$$

(4.13) allows us to pass to the limit in $J(1;x_i)$ to get

$$\int_{B_1(0)}\frac{|\nabla u_\infty|^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy\int_{B_1(0)}\frac{|\nabla v_\infty|^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy=0.$$

Similar to the first case we can deduce $u_\infty=v_\infty=0$, a contradiction once again. So there must exist a constant C such that for all $x\in\{u=v\}$,

$$J(1;x)\ge C.$$

□

Note that in the above proof, if $L_i\to+\infty$, the limit is $(u_\infty,v_\infty)=((e\cdot x)^+,(e\cdot x)^-)$ with a unit vector e. In this case we have

$$J(1;u_\infty,v_\infty)=\lim_{i\to+\infty}J(1;u_i,v_i)>0,$$

while by the upper bound on $J(r;x_i)$ we have

$$J(1;x_i)=L_i^4J(1;u_i,v_i)\le C.$$

This is a contradiction. So L_i must be uniformly bounded. Combining this with Proposition 2.4, we get

Corollary 4.10. *There exists a constant C such that for every $x\in\{u=v\}$,*

$$\int_{\partial B_1(x)}u^2+v^2\le C.$$

Consequently, for every $R>0$

$$\sup_{B_R(x)}u+v\le C(1+R).$$

This result can be seen as the converse of Lemma 4.7.

5 The global Lipschitz bound

In this section we prove

Theorem 5.1. *Let* (u,v) *be a solution of* (1.1) *satisfying the linear growth condition* (1.5)*, then there is a constant* $C>0$ *such that*

$$\sup_{\mathbb{R}^n}|\nabla u|+|\nabla v|\le C.$$

The proof is composed by three lemmas. First we show that $u-v$ can be well approximated by a linear function with unit slope in $B_R(x)$, if $x\in\{u=v\}$ and R is large enough (uniformly with respect to $x\in\{u=v\}$).

Lemma 5.2. *For every* $h\in(0,1/10)$*, there exists a* R_0 *such that, for every* $x_0\in\{u=v\}$ *and* $R\ge R_0$*, there exists a vector* e *and a constant* C *(*C *independent of* h*),*

$$\frac{1}{C}\le|e|\le C,$$

such that

$$\sup_{B_R(x_0)}|u-[e\cdot(x-x_0)]^+|+|v-[e\cdot(x-x_0)]^-|\le hR. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Consider

$$u_R(x)=\frac{1}{L(R)}u(x_0+Rx),v_R(x)=\frac{1}{L(R)}v(x_0+Rx),$$

where $L(R)$ is chosen so that

$$\int_{\partial B_1(0)}u_R^2+v_R^2=1.$$

By the mean value inequality for subharmonic functions and Lemma 4.7,

$$L(R)^2=\frac{1}{|\partial B_R|}\int_{\partial B_R(x_0)}u^2+v^2\ge C.$$

Since (u_R,v_R) satisfies (1.1) with parameter $L(R)^2R^2$, if $R\ge R_0=\sqrt{K}$, (u_R,v_R) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.7. Then we get a unit vector e such that

$$\sup_{B_1(0)}|u_R-(e\cdot x)^+|+|v_R-(e\cdot x)^-|\le h.$$

We claim that there exists a constant C independent of h, such that

$$\begin{aligned}&J(1;0,u_R,v_R)\\ =\;&\int_{B_1(0)}\frac{|\nabla u_R(y)|^2+L(R)^2R^2u_R(y)^2v_R(y)^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy\int_{B_1(0)}\frac{|\nabla v_R(y)|^2+L(R)^2R^2u_R(y)^2v_R(y)^2}{|y|^{n-2}}dy\end{aligned}$$

$$\in \quad (\frac{1}{C}, C).$$

The upper bound can be obtained by using (4.11) and the uniform upper bound of u_R and v_R in $B_2(0)$. The lower bound can be got by restricting the first integral to the domain $\{e\cdot x \geq C(n)h\}\cap B_1(0)$, where $C(n)$ is chosen large enough so that in $\{e\cdot x \geq C(n)h\}\cap B_1(0)$, $|\nabla u_R - e| \leq 1/4$ and $L(R)^2R^2u_R(y)^2v_R(y)^2 \leq e^{-R}$. (This is an application of Lemma 2.5 and similar estimates hold for the second integral.)

On the other hand, by resacling the estimate in Corollary 4.9, we get

$$\frac{1}{C}\frac{R^2}{L(R)^2} \leq J(1;0,u_R,v_R) = \frac{R^2}{L(R)^2}J(R;x_0,u,v) \leq C\frac{R^2}{L(R)^2}.$$

Combining these two we see

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq \frac{L(R)}{R} \leq C.$$

A suitable rescaling gives the required result. □

The next estimate is a standard interior gradient estimate for elliptic equations ([10]).

Lemma 5.3. *For every $K > 0$ and $R > 1$, there exists a constant $C(K,R) > 0$, if (u_κ, v_κ) satisfies (1.3) in $B_R(0)$ with $\kappa \leq K$, and*

$$\sup_{B_R(0)} |u_\kappa - x_1^+| + |v_\kappa - x_1^-| \leq 1.$$

Then

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)} |\nabla u_\kappa| + |\nabla v_\kappa| \leq C(K,R).$$

Finally, for solutions appearing in Lemma 5.1, in the good part (far away from $\{e\cdot x = 0\}$), we have the following bound on the gradient.

Lemma 5.4. *For every $h_0 \in (0, 1/100)$, there exists a $K_2 > 0$, if (u_κ, v_κ) satisfies (1.3) in $B_1(0)$ with $\kappa \geq K_2$, and*

$$\sup_{B_1(0)} |u_\kappa - x_1^+| + |v_\kappa - x_1^-| \leq h_0,$$

then there is a constant $C(n)$, which depends on n only, such that

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)\setminus\{|x_1|\geq 4h_0\}} |\nabla u_\kappa| + |\nabla v_\kappa| \leq C(n).$$

Proof. Take an $x_0 \in B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0) \setminus \{x_1 \geq 4h_0\}$. In $B_{2h_0}(x_0)$,

$$u_\kappa \geq h_0 \geq v_\kappa.$$

By Lemma 2.5, we get

$$\sup_{B_{h_0}(x_0)} v_\kappa \le C_1(n) h_0 e^{-C_2(n)\kappa^{1/2} h_0^{3/2}}.$$

If K_2 large enough and $\kappa \ge K_2$, then there is a constant $C(n)$ such that

$$\sup_{B_{h_0}(x_0)} \Delta u_\kappa + \Delta v_\kappa \le C(n).$$

Then

$$|\nabla u_\kappa(x_0)| \le C[\frac{1}{h_0}\text{osc}_{B_{h_0}(x_0)} u_\kappa + h_0 \sup_{B_{h_0}(x_0)} \Delta u_\kappa] \le C.$$

Similar estimate holds for v_κ. □

Now we come to the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof. For every $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Take $R/2 = \text{dist}(y_0, \{u = v\})$ and an $x_0 \in \{u = v\}$ realizing this distance. Without loss of generality, assume $u > v$ in $B_{R/2}(y_0)$.

If $R \le R_0$, Corollary 4.10 implies

$$\sup_{B_{R/2}(y_0)} u + v \le C(R_0).$$

Then as in Lemma 5.3, we can get an upper bound of $|\nabla u(y_0)| + |\nabla v(y_0)|$, which depends only on R_0 and some universal constants.

If $R \ge R_0$, Lemma 5.2 is applicable. So there exist a vector e and a small h determined by R_0, such that (5.1) holds. Because $u > v$ in $B_{R/2}(y_0)$, $\{e \cdot (x - x_0) < -2hR\} \cap B_{R/2}(y_0) = \emptyset$. Assuming $h < 1/10$, we know $u - v \ge \frac{R}{8}$ in $B_{R/4}(y_0)$. Define

$$u_R(x) = \frac{1}{R} u(x_0 + Rx), v_R(x) = \frac{1}{R} v(x_0 + Rx).$$

Denote $z_0 = \frac{y_0 - x_0}{R} \in B_{1/2}(0)$. We can apply Lemma 5.4 to (u_R, v_R) to get a uniform upper bound of $|\nabla u_R(z_0)| + |\nabla v_R(z_0)|$. This implies an upper bound of $|\nabla u(y_0)| + |\nabla v(y_0)|$, which depends only on h and some universal constants. □

6 Comparison with harmonic functions

In this section we first present some consequences of the global Lipschitz continuity. Note that it is possible to prove these results directly in the proof of Theorem 5.1. However, for simplicity of presentations, we state these results as corollaries of the global Lipschitz continuity.

Lemma 6.1. *There exists a universal constant C such that*

$$uv \le C \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. Fix a large constant $M > 0$. Take an $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Without loss of generality we can assume $u(x_0) = A > M$. Because $|\nabla u| + |\nabla v| \leq C$,

$$u \geq A - C > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(x_0),$$

and

$$\Delta v \geq (A - C)^2 v \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(x_0).$$

By Lemma 2.5 and the Lipshctiz continuity of v, we have

$$v(x_0) \leq C_1(v(x_0) + C)e^{-C_2\sqrt{A-C}}.$$

This implies

$$v(x_0) \leq Ce^{-\frac{A}{C}}.$$

Hence

$$u(x_0)v(x_0) \leq CAe^{-\frac{A}{C}} \leq C(M),$$

for a constant $C(M)$ depending only on M. □

The same method gives

Corollary 6.2. *There exists a universal constant C such that*

$$uv^2 + u^2v \leq C \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Lemma 6.3.

$$u|\nabla v| + v|\nabla u| \leq C \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. Fix a large constant $M > 0$. Take an $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Because $|\nabla v| \leq C$, we can assume $u(x_0) = A > M$. The proof of the previous lemma in fact shows

$$v \leq Ce^{-\frac{A}{C}} \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(x_0).$$

Then by the classical estimate on the gradient estimate of elliptic equations and the equation of v we get

$$|\nabla v(x_0)| \leq \sup_{B_1(x_0)} (v + \Delta v) \leq Ce^{-\frac{A}{C}}.$$

So

$$u(x_0)|\nabla v(x_0)| \leq CAe^{-\frac{A}{C}} \leq C.$$

□

Lemma 6.4. *For every ball $B_R(x_0)$,*

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} u^2v^2 \leq CR^{n-1}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} uv^2 = \int_{B_R(x_0)} \Delta u = \int_{\partial B_R(x_0)} u_r \leq \int_{\partial B_R(x_0)} |\nabla u| \leq CR^{n-1}.$$

The same estimate holds for vu^2.

Now by Lemma 6.1, for every x either $u(x)$ or $v(x) \leq C$, so

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} u^2v^2 \leq C\int_{B_R(x_0)} u^2v + uv^2 \leq CR^{n-1}.$$

□

For every ball $B_R(x_0)$, let φ_{R,x_0} be the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\varphi_{R,x_0} = 0 \ \text{ in } \ B_R(x_0), \\ \varphi_{R,x_0} = u - v \ \text{ on } \ \partial B_R(x_0). \end{cases}$$

Because u and v are smooth in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\varphi_{R,x_0} \in C^\infty(\overline{B_R(x_0)})$. It is possible that φ_{R,x_0} are uniformly Lipschitz, that is, there is a universal constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{B_{R,x_0}} |\nabla\varphi_R(x_0)| \leq C.$$

However currently we do not know how to prove this. Instead we give a weaker result, which is sufficient for our use.

Lemma 6.5. *For every $\delta \in (0,1)$, there exists a universal constant C such that for every $R \geq 1$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\sup_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla\varphi_{R,x_0}| \leq CR^\delta. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. Because u and v are globally Lipschitz continuous,

$$\tilde{u}(x) := \frac{1}{R}(u(x_0 + Rx) - u(x_0)), \tilde{v}(x) := \frac{1}{R}(v(x_0 + Rx) - v(x_0))$$

are uniformly bounded in $Lip(\overline{B_1(0)})$. By the global Hölder continuity estimate applied to harmonic functions (see [10]),

$$\tilde{\varphi}(x) := \frac{1}{R}(\varphi_{R,x_0}(x_0 + Rx) - \varphi_{R,x_0}(x_0))$$

is uniformly bounded in $C^{1-\delta}(\overline{B_1(0)})$.

By noting the boundary condition of $\tilde{\varphi}$, we get a universal constant C such that

$$|\tilde{u}(x) - \tilde{v}(x) - \tilde{\varphi}(x)| \leq C(1 - |x|)^{1-\delta} \ \text{ in } \ B_1(0).$$

Rescaling back we get

$$|u(x) - v(x) - \varphi_{R,x_0}(x)| \leq CR^{\delta}(R - |x - x_0|)^{1-\delta} \quad \text{in} \quad B_R(x_0). \tag{6.2}$$

By the boundary gradient estimate [10], for every $x \in \partial B_R(x_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla(u - v - \varphi_{R,x_0})(x)| &\leq C \sup_{B_1(x)\cap B_R(x_0)} |\Delta(u - v - \varphi_{R,x_0})| + C \sup_{B_1(x)\cap B_R(x_0)} |u - v - \varphi_{R,x_0}| \\ &\leq CR^{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above we have used Corollary 6.2 to estimate $\Delta(u - v)$.

Since $|\nabla u| + |\nabla v| \leq C$ for a universal constant, by choosing a larger constant, we get

$$\sup_{\partial B_R(x_0)} |\nabla \varphi_{R,x_0}| \leq CR^{\delta} + C \leq CR^{\delta}.$$

(6.1) follows by applying the maximum principle to $|\nabla \varphi_{R,x_0}|$. ☐

Proposition 6.6.

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla(u - v - \varphi_{R,x_0})|^2 \leq CR^{n-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Fix a $\delta \in (0, 1/8)$ and take a constant C so that the previous lemma holds. For simplicity, we assume $x_0 = 0$ and denote φ_{R,x_0} by φ. Direct calculations give

$$\int_{B_R} |\nabla(u - v - \varphi)|^2 = \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + |\nabla\varphi|^2 - 2\nabla u\nabla v - 2\nabla u\nabla\varphi + 2\nabla v\nabla\varphi.$$

We divide the estimate into three parts.

Step 1. An integration by parts gives

$$\int_{B_R} \nabla(u - v)\nabla\varphi = \int_{\partial B_R} \varphi\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial r} = \int_{B_R} |\nabla\varphi|^2.$$

Step 2. Take $\bar{u} = \varphi^+$, $\bar{v} = \varphi^-$ in B_{R-1}, $\bar{u} = (R - |x|)\varphi^+ + (|x| - R + 1)u(x)$, $\bar{v} = (R - |x|)\varphi^- + (|x| - R + 1)v(x)$ in $B_R \setminus B_{R-1}$. Noting that $\bar{u} = u$, $\bar{v} = v$ on ∂B_R, hence by the locally energy minimizing property of (u, v) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2v^2 &\leq \int_{B_R} |\nabla\bar{u}|^2 + |\nabla\bar{v}|^2 + \bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2 \\ &= \int_{B_{R-1}} |\nabla\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_R\setminus B_{R-1}} |\nabla\bar{u}|^2 + |\nabla\bar{v}|^2 + \bar{u}^2\bar{v}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We need to estimate the last integral.

In $B_R \setminus B_{R-1}$, similar to the derivation of (6.2), we have

$$|u - \varphi^+| + |v - \varphi^-| \leq CR^{\delta}. \tag{6.3}$$

Combing this with (6.1) we get, for $x \in B_R \setminus B_{R-1}$

$$|\nabla \bar{u}(x)| \leq (R - |x|)|\nabla \varphi^+(x)| + (|x| - R + 1)|\nabla u(x)| + |\nabla |x|||u(x) - \varphi^+(x)| \leq CR^\delta. \tag{6.4}$$

Similarly $|\nabla \bar{v}| \leq CR^\delta$ in $B_R \setminus B_{R-1}$.

We claim that in $B_R \setminus B_{R-1}$,

$$\bar{u}\bar{v} \leq (\varphi^+ + u)(\varphi^- + v) \leq \varphi^+ v + \varphi^- u + uv \leq CR^{2\delta}. \tag{6.5}$$

In view of Lemma 6.1, we only need to estimate $\varphi^+ v$. There are two cases. If $\varphi^+(x) \in (0, 2CR^\delta)$ (C as in (6.3)), then because $\varphi^-(x) = 0$, (6.3) implies $v(x) \leq CR^\delta$. So

$$\varphi^+(x)v(x) \leq 2C^2 R^{2\delta}.$$

If $\varphi^+(x) \geq 2CR^\delta$, then again by (6.3),

$$u(x) \geq \varphi^+(x) - CR^\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}\varphi^+(x).$$

So by Lemma 6.1,

$$v(x) \leq \frac{C}{u(x)} \leq \frac{2C}{\varphi^+(x)}.$$

This again implies (6.5) and this finishes the proof of the claim.

Combing (6.4) and (6.5) we get

$$\int_{B_R \setminus B_{R-1}} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 + |\nabla \bar{v}|^2 + \bar{u}^2 \bar{v}^2 \leq CR^{n-1+4\delta} \leq CR^{n-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This implies

$$\int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 + u^2 v^2 \leq \int_{B_R} |\nabla \varphi|^2 + CR^{n-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Step 3. Finally, let us estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\int_{B_R} \nabla u \nabla v| &= |\int_{\partial B_R} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} v - \int_{B_R} v \Delta u| \\ &\leq \int_{\partial B_R} |\nabla u| v + \int_{B_R} v \Delta u \\ &\leq \int_{B_R} v \Delta u + CR^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used Lemma 6.3 to estimate the boundary integral.

Denote the measure $\mu = \Delta u dx$. Note that for every $t > 0$,

$$\mu(\{v > t\} \cap B_R) \leq \mu(B_R) \leq CR^{n-1}$$

and because in $\{v > t\}$, $u \leq Ce^{-\frac{t}{C}}$ and $\Delta u \leq Ce^{-\frac{t}{C}}$ for a universal constant C (by Lemma 2.5), we have

$$\mu(\{v > t\} \cap B_R) \leq Ce^{-\frac{t}{C}} R^n.$$

Now if R is large enough, by choosing $M = C \log R$ and dividing the integration into two parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R} v d\mu &= \int_0^{+\infty} \mu(\{v > t\} \cap B_R) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^M CR^{n-1} + \int_M^{+\infty} Ce^{-\frac{t}{C}} R^n \\ &\leq CR^{n-1}(\log R + 1) \\ &\leq CR^{n-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting Step 1 to 3 together we finish the proof. □

7 Uniqueness of the asymptotic cone at infinity

Fix a base point x_0. By Proposition 6.6, for every $R \geq 1$,

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla \varphi_{R,x_0} - \nabla \varphi_{2R,x_0}|^2 \leq CR^{n-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since both $\nabla \varphi_{R,x_0}$ and $\nabla \varphi_{R,x_0}$ are harmonic functions, we get

$$\sup_{B_{R/2}(x_0)} |\nabla \varphi_{R,x_0} - \nabla \varphi_{2R,x_0}| \leq CR^{-\frac{1}{4}}. \tag{7.1}$$

Hence for every fixed r and i large,

$$\sup_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla \varphi_{2^i,x_0} - \nabla \varphi_{2^{i+1},x_0}| \leq C2^{-\frac{i}{4}}.$$

Adding in i we see $\lim_{i \to +\infty} \nabla \varphi_{2^i,x_0} = \nabla \varphi_\infty$ exists. By Lemma 6.5, for any $R \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{B_R(0)} |\nabla \varphi_\infty| \leq CR^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \sum_{i \geq 1} 2^{-\frac{i}{4}} \leq CR^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since $\nabla \varphi_\infty$ is an entire harmonic vector-valued function, by the Liouville theorem, it is a constant vector function. In conclusion, there exists a constant vector $e(x_0)$ such that

$$\lim_{i \to +\infty} \nabla \varphi_{2^i,x_0} = e(x_0)$$

uniformly on any compact set of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Furthermore, by choosing i_0 such that $2^{i_0-1} < R \leq 2^i_0$, adding in i from i_0 to $+\infty$ and using (7.1), we have

$$\sup_{B_{R/2}(x_0)} |\nabla\varphi_{R,x_0} - e(x_0)| \leq CR^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Substituting this into Proposition 6.6, we have for every $R \geq 1$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla(u-v) - e(x_0)|^2 \leq CR^{n-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{7.2}$$

Combing this fact with the result in Section 3 and Remark 4.6, we know

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty} \frac{u(x_0+Rx)}{R} = (e(x_0)\cdot x)^+, \lim_{R\to+\infty} \frac{v(x_0+Rx)}{R} = (e(x_0)\cdot x)^+,$$

uniformly on any compact set of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Next we note that such $e(x_0)$ is independent of the base point x_0. This is because we also have

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty} \frac{u(x_0+Rx)}{R} = \lim_{R\to+\infty} \frac{u(R(x+\frac{x_0}{R}))}{R} = (e(0)\cdot x)^+$$

uniformly on any compact set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. So $e(x_0) = e(0)$, which is independent of x_0.

In conclusion, we have proved

Proposition 7.1. *There exists a vector e_0, such that for every $R \geq 1$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\int_{B_R(x_0)} |\nabla(u-v) - e_0|^2 \leq CR^{n-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{7.3}$$

By Remark 4.6, we can take e_0 such that $|e_0| = 1$. In the following of this paper we will assume $e_0 = e_n$, the n-th coordinate direction.

8 Existence of a cone of monotonicity

Lemma 8.1. *There exists a $M > 0$ such that if $|u(x_0) - v(x_0)| \geq M$, then*

$$|\nabla(u-v)(x_0) - e_n| \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Proof. Assume $u(x_0) - v(x_0) = A > M$. Denote

$$\widetilde{u}(x) = \frac{1}{A}u(x_0+Ax), \widetilde{v}(x) = \frac{1}{A}v(x_0+Ax).$$

Then by Lemma 6.1 and the Lipschitz continuity of u and v, in $B_{1/C}(0)$,

$$\Delta\widetilde{u}(x) = A^4\widetilde{u}(x)\widetilde{v}(x)^2 \leq Ce^{-\frac{\sqrt{A}}{C}}, \Delta\widetilde{v}(x) = A^4\widetilde{u}(x)^2\widetilde{v}(x) \leq Ce^{-\frac{\sqrt{A}}{C}}.$$

By (7.3), we also have

$$\int_{B_{1/C}(0)} |\nabla(\widetilde{u}-\widetilde{v})-e_n|^2 \le CA^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

If M is large enough, the $W^{2,p}$ estimate (for $p>n$) and the Sobolev embedding theorem implies

$$|\nabla(\widetilde{u}-\widetilde{v})(0)-e_n| \le \frac{1}{4}.$$

Rescaling back to u and v we get the claim. □

The constant $1/4$ can be made arbitrarily small, if we choose M large enough.

Corollary 8.2. *If $u(x)-v(x)\ge M$, then $|\nabla u(x)-e_n|\le 1/2$. If $v(x)-u(x)\ge M$, then $|\nabla v(x)-e_n|\le 1/2$.*

Proof. Assume M is large enough. If $u(x)-v(x)\ge M$, then by Lemma 6.3, $|\nabla v(x)|\le \frac{1}{4}$. Hence

$$|\nabla u(x)-e_n| \le |\nabla(u-v)(x)-e_n| + |\nabla v(x)| \le 1/2.$$

□

Corollary 8.3. *For $|t|>M$, $\{u-v=t\}$ is a Lipschitz graph of the form $\{x_n=f(x',t)\}$, with the Lipschitz constant of f (with respect to x') less than 1.*

Proof. We need to note that for every $x_0=(x_0',0)\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty}\frac{1}{R}(u-v)(x_0+Rx)=x_n.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{x_n\to+\infty}(u-v)(x_0',x_n)=+\infty,\ \lim_{x_n\to-\infty}(u-v)(x_0',x_n)=-\infty.$$

Since $u-v$ is strictly increasing in the direction of e_n in $\{|u-v|>M\}$, for every $|t|>M$ and $x'\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, there is a unique finite $f(x',t)$ such that $(u-v)(x',f(x',t))=t$. [3]

There is a cone of directions

$$C(e_n,1/4)=\{e\in\mathbb{R}^n, |e|=1, e\cdot e_n\ge 1/4\},$$

such that for every $e\in C(e_n,1/4)$, and $x\in\{|u-v|\ge M\}$,

$$\nabla(u-v)(x)\cdot e\ge 0.$$

That is, in $\{|u-v|\ge M\}$, $u-v$ is monotone increasing along the directions in $C(e_n,1/4)$. This gives the Lipschitz continuity of f. □

---

[3] For example, if $u(x',x_n)-v(x',x_n)=t>M$, then $\frac{\partial(u-v)}{\partial x_n}(x',x_n)>0$, so $u(x',y_n)-v(x',y_n)>t$ for those $y_n>x_n$ close to x_n. Then by continuation using the monotonicity of $u-v$ in $\{u-v>M\}$, $u(x',y_n)-v(x',y_n)>t$ for all $y_n>x_n$.

In the following we denote the level set $\{u-v=t\}$ by Γ_t. By the previous lemma, for $|t|\geq M$, $\Gamma_t=\{x_n=f(x',t)\}$. The following result states that the width (in the x_n direction) of $\{|u-v|<M\}$ is bounded.

Lemma 8.4. *There is a universal constant C, if M is large enough, then*

$$\sup_{x'\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} f(x',M)-f(x',-M)\leq CM.$$

Proof. Take an arbitrary $x_0=(x_0',f(x_0',M))\in\Gamma_M$. By Lemma 5.2 and Proposition 7.1, if M is large enough (but independent of x_0),

$$\sup_{B_3(0)}|\frac{1}{M}u(x_0+Mx)-\frac{1}{M}v(x_0+Mx)-x_n-1|\leq 1.$$

Hence

$$\inf_{B_3(0)}\frac{1}{M}u(x_0+Mx)-\frac{1}{M}v(x_0+Mx)\leq -3+1+1\leq -1.$$

That is, $B_{3M}(x_0)\cap\{u-v\leq -M\}\neq\emptyset$, or $\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\Gamma_{-M})\leq 3M$.

Take $y_0=(y_0',f(y_0',-M))\in B_{3M}(x_0)\cap\Gamma_{-M}$. By the monotonicity of $u-v$ in the direction of $C(e_n,1/4)$ in $\{u-v\leq -M\}$, for a sufficiently large universal constant C

$$\{(x',x_n):x_n<f(y_0',-M)-C|x'-y_0'|\}\subset\{u-v<-M\}.$$

Thus for (x_0',x_n) such that

$$x_n\leq f(y_0',-M)-C|x_0'-y_0'|,$$

we have $(x_0',x_n)\in\{u-v<-M\}$. In other words,

$$f(x_0',-M)\geq f(y_0',-M)-C|x_0'-y_0'|.$$

Note that

$$|f(y_0',-M)-f(x_0',M)|+|x_0'-y_0'|\leq 3M.$$

Combing these two inequalities we get

$$f(x_0',-M)\geq f(x_0',M)-CM.$$

□

Proposition 8.5. *For each $\tau\in C(e_n,3/4)$, we have*

$$u_\tau=\tau\cdot\nabla u\geq 0; v_\tau=\tau\cdot\nabla v\leq 0 \quad in \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. For $t \geq 0$, define

$$u^t(x) := u(x+t\tau), v^t(x) := v(x+t\tau).$$

We will prove that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$u^t(x) \geq u(x), v^t(x) \leq v(x) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{8.1}$$

By Corollary 8.2, $u_\tau \geq 0$ in $\{u-v > M\}$ and $v_\tau \leq 0$ in $\{u-v \leq -M\}$. So for every $t \geq 0$, $u^t \geq u$ in $\{u-v > M\}$ and $v^t \leq v$ in $\{u-v \leq -M\}$.

Step 1. (8.1) holds for t large enough.
By the previous lemma, for $x \in \{-M \leq u-v \leq M\}$, if $t \geq CM$, $x+te_n \in \{u-v \geq 2M\}$. Because $\tau \in C(e_n, 3/4) \subset\subset C(e_n, 1/4)$, if $t \geq (C+64)M$, $x+t\tau \in x+CMe_n+C(e_n,1/4) \subset \{u-v \geq 2M\}$. Since

$$-M \leq u(x)-v(x) \leq M,$$

we have

$$u(x) \leq 2M \leq u(x+t\tau).$$

That is, $u^t \geq u$ in $\{-M \leq u-v \leq M\}$.

Next we show that $u^t \geq u$ in $\Omega = \{u-v < -M\}$. By Lemma 6.1 and the global Lipschitz continuity, u and u^t are bounded in Ω. Assume $\inf_\Omega(u^t-u) < 0$. Take a sequence of $x_k \in \Omega$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty}(u^t(x_k)-u(x_k)) = \inf_\Omega(u^t-u) < 0.$$

Because

$$\liminf_{k\to+\infty} u(x_k) \geq \lim_{k\to+\infty}(u(x_k)-u^t(x_k)) > 0,$$

there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $u(x_k) \geq \delta$ for all k. By Lemma 6.1, $v(x_k) \leq C/\delta$. Now define

$$u_k(x) = u(x_k+x), v_k(x) = v(x_k+x).$$

Since $u_k(0)$ and $v_k(0)$ are uniformly bounded, and $\sup\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u_k| + |\nabla v_k| \leq C$, there exist two continuous functions u_∞ and v_∞ such that

$$u_k \to u_\infty, v_k \to v_\infty \quad \text{uniformly on any compact set of} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

(u_∞, v_∞) is a solution of (1.1). They also satisfy $u^t_\infty(x) = u_\infty(x+t\tau) \geq u_\infty(x)$ in $\{u_\infty - v_\infty \geq -M\}$ and $v^t_\infty(x) \leq v_\infty(x)$ in $\{u_\infty - v_\infty \leq -M\}$. Then

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u_\infty = u_\infty v_\infty^2 \quad \text{in} \quad \{u_\infty - v_\infty < -M\}, \\ \Delta u^t_\infty = u^t_\infty (v^t_\infty)^2 \leq u^t_\infty v^2_\infty \quad \text{in} \quad \{u_\infty - v_\infty < -M\}, \\ u^t_\infty \geq u_\infty \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\{u_\infty - v_\infty < -M\}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$u^t_\infty(0) - u_\infty(0) = \inf_{\{u_\infty - v_\infty < -M\}} (u^t_\infty - u_\infty) < 0.$$

A direct application of the maximum principle implies a contradiction.

We can use similar method to show that $v^t \leq v$ in $\{u - v \geq -M\}$.

Step 2. By the result in Step 1, we can define

$$t_0 := \inf\{t : (8.1) \text{ holds for all } s > t\}.$$

Assume $t_0 > 0$. Since $u^{t_0} \geq u$ and $v^{t_0} \leq v$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u^{t_0} = u^{t_0}(v^{t_0})^2 \leq u^{t_0} v^2, \\ \Delta v^{t_0} = v^{t_0}(u^{t_0})^2 \geq v^{t_0} u^2. \end{cases}$$

Comparing with u and v, the strong maximum principle implies that

$$u^{t_0} > u, v^{t_0} < v \text{ strictly in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Here we need to note that, there is a constant $\delta > 0$ such that in $\{u - v > M\}$, by Corollary 8.2

$$u^{t_0}(x) - u(x) = \int_0^{t_0} \tau \cdot \nabla u(x + t\tau) dt \geq \delta.$$

And similarly in $\{u - v < -M\}$,

$$v^{t_0}(x) - v(x) \leq -\delta.$$

These two estimates imply that

$$u^{t_0} - v^{t_0} \geq u - v + \delta \text{ in } \{|u - v| > M\}.$$

Then similar to the method in Step 1, we can prove

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u^{t_0} - v^{t_0}) - (u - v) > 0.$$

By the global Lipschitz continuity of $u - v$, there exists a $\varepsilon > 0$, such that for all $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0)$,

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u^t - v^t) - (u - v) > 0.$$

We claim that for such t, (8.1) still holds. We only prove the inequality for u and the other one is similar. As before we only need to consider the set $\{u - v < M\}$. Here we use

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = u(u - \varphi)^2 \text{ in } \{u - v < M\}, \\ \Delta u^t = u^t(u^t - \varphi^t)^2 \text{ in } \{u - v < M\}, \\ u^t \geq u \text{ on } \partial\{u - v < M\}, \end{cases}$$

where $\varphi = u - v$ and $\varphi^t = u^t - v^t$. Assume that

$$\inf_{\{u - v < M\}} (u^t - u) < 0.$$

First let us assume this minimum is attained at an interior point $x_0 \in \{u - v < M\}$. The maximum principle implies

$$0 \le \Delta(u^t - u)(x_0) = u^t(x_0)(u^t(x_0) - \varphi^t(x_0))^2 - u(x_0)(u(x_0) - \varphi(x_0))^2 < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Here we have used the following facts: $0 < u^t(x_0) < u(x_0)$, $u(x_0) > \varphi(x_0)$, $u^t(x_0) > \varphi^t(x_0)$ and $\varphi(x_0) < \varphi^t(x_0)$.

Next, if the minimum is not attained, we can use the method in Step 1 to reduce this case to the above case and we get a contradiction again. In conclusion we must have

$$u^t \ge u \text{ in } \{u - v < M\}.$$

So for $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0)$, we still have (8.1). This is a contradiction with the definition of t_0 if $t_0 > 0$. In other words, $t_0 = 0$. ☐

9 Enlargement of the cone of monotonicity

In the previous section we have proved that for every $\tau \in C(e_n, 3/4)$,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau} \ge 0, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \tau} \le 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Now we will enlarge this cone of monotonicity.

Proposition 9.1. *For every unit vector τ such that $\tau \cdot e_n = 0$,*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau} \equiv 0, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \tau} \equiv 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

This means u and v depend only on the x_n variable and this finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof. For $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$, denote

$$\tau(\theta) = \cos(\theta) e_n + \sin(\theta)\tau.$$

Define

$$I := \{\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}] : \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau(\theta)} \ge 0, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \tau(\theta)} \le 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

By Proposition 8.5, $[0, \pi/100] \subset I$. We want to prove $I = [0, \pi/2]$. First we have

Claim. For every $\theta_0 \in I$ and $\theta_0 < \pi/2$, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\partial(u - v)}{\partial \tau(\theta_0)} \ge \delta \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

By Lemma 8.1 (if we choose M large enough, depending on $\tau(\theta_0) \cdot e_n$), in $\{|u - v| \ge M\}$,

$$|\nabla(u - v) - e_n| \le \frac{\tau(\theta_0) \cdot e_n}{2}.$$

Hence in $\{|u-v| \geq M\}$,

$$\frac{\partial(u-v)}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} \geq \frac{\tau(\theta_0)\cdot e_n}{2} > 0.$$

So the problem lies in the set $\{|u-v| \leq M\}$. Assume

$$\inf_{\{|u-v|\leq M\}} \frac{\partial(u-v)}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} = 0.$$

Take a minimizing sequence x_k and proceed as in the proof of Proposition 8.5, we get a solution of (1.1), (u_∞, v_∞) such that

1. $\frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} \geq 0$, $\frac{\partial v_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} \leq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$;
2. $\frac{\partial(u_\infty - v_\infty)}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} \geq \frac{\tau(\theta)\cdot e_n}{2} > 0$ in $\{|u-v| \geq M\}$;
3. $\frac{\partial(u_\infty - v_\infty)}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)}(0) = 0$, i.e. $\frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)}(0) = \frac{\partial v_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)}(0) = 0$.

By differentiating the equations of u_∞ and v_∞, we find

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \dfrac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} = \dfrac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} v_\infty^2 + 2u_\infty v_\infty \dfrac{\partial v_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)}, \\ \Delta \dfrac{\partial v_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} = \dfrac{\partial v_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} u_\infty^2 + 2u_\infty v_\infty \dfrac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)}. \end{cases}$$

By the sign of $\frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)}$ and $\frac{\partial v_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)}$, we can apply the strong maximum principle to deduce that either

$$\frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} \equiv 0, \frac{\partial v_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n,$$

which contradicts (2) in the above, or

$$\frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} > 0, \frac{\partial v_\infty}{\partial\tau(\theta_0)} < 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n,$$

which contradicts (3) in the above. This finishes the proof of the claim.

By the boundedness of $\nabla(u-v)$ and the above claim, for $\theta_0 \in I$ and $\theta_0 < \pi/2$, there exists a $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $\theta \in (\theta_0 - \varepsilon, \theta_0]$,

$$\frac{\partial(u-v)}{\partial\tau(\theta)} \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Similar to Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 8.5, for such θ we still have

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial\tau(\theta)} \geq 0, \frac{\partial v}{\partial\tau(\theta)} \leq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

That is, $(\theta_0-\varepsilon,\theta_0)\subset I$. By continuation, we get $I=[0,\pi/2]$. In particular,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}\geq 0, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \tau}\leq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Replacing τ by $-\tau$, we get

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}\equiv 0, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \tau}\equiv 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n.$$

□

A Appendix

Here we give a proof of Theorem 2.6. Since the method is exactly the one given in [12], we only show the necessary modifications.

Let (u_κ, v_κ) be given as in Theorem 2.6 and fix an $\alpha\in(0,1)$. Here, without loss of generality, we assume that u_κ and v_κ are defined in $B_3(0)$, and uniformly bounded there.

Take $\eta\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\eta\equiv 1$ in $B_1(0)$, $\{\eta>0\}=B_2(0)$, and $\eta=(2-|x|)^2$ in $B_2(0)\setminus B_{3/2}(0)$. By this choice we get a constant C such that

$$|\nabla \log \eta|\leq \frac{C}{\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial B_2(0))} \quad \text{in} \quad B_2(0).$$

Then for any $x\in B_2(0)$, by taking $\rho:=\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{dist}(x,\partial B_2(0))$, we have

$$\frac{\sup_{B_\rho(x)}\eta}{\inf_{B_\rho(x)}\eta}\leq C, \tag{A.1}$$

where C is independent of ρ.

Denote

$$\hat{u}_\kappa=u_\kappa\eta, \hat{v}_\kappa=v_\kappa\eta.$$

Assume there exist $x_\kappa, y_\kappa\in B_2(0)$ such that as $\kappa\to+\infty$,

$$L_\kappa=\frac{|\hat{u}_\kappa(x_\kappa)-\hat{u}_\kappa(y_\kappa)|+|\hat{v}_\kappa(x_\kappa)-\hat{v}_\kappa(y_\kappa)|}{|x_\kappa-y_\kappa|^\alpha}=\max_{x,y\in B_2(0)}\frac{|\hat{u}_\kappa(x)-\hat{u}_\kappa(y)|+|\hat{v}_\kappa(x)-\hat{v}_\kappa(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha}\to+\infty. \tag{A.2}$$

Note that because u_κ and v_κ are uniformly bounded, as $\kappa\to+\infty$, $|x_\kappa-y_\kappa|\to 0$.

Define

$$\widetilde{u}_\kappa(x):=\frac{1}{L_\kappa r_\kappa^\alpha}\widehat{u}_\kappa(x_\kappa+r_\kappa x), \widetilde{v}_\kappa(x):=\frac{1}{L_\kappa r_\kappa^\alpha}\widehat{v}_\kappa(x_\kappa+r_\kappa x),$$

and

$$\bar{u}_\kappa(x):=\frac{1}{L_\kappa r_\kappa^\alpha}u_\kappa(x_\kappa+r_\kappa x)\eta(x_\kappa), \bar{v}_\kappa(x):=\frac{1}{L_\kappa r_\kappa^\alpha}v_\kappa(x_\kappa+r_\kappa x)\eta(x_\kappa),$$

where $r_\kappa\to 0$ will be determined later. These functions are defined in $\Omega_\kappa=\frac{1}{r_\kappa}(B_2(0)-x_\kappa)$. Note that Ω_κ converges to Ω_∞, which may be the entire space or an half space.

We first present some facts about these rescaled functions, which will be used below.

$$\widetilde{u}_\kappa(x) = \frac{\eta(x_\kappa + r_\kappa x)}{\eta(x_\kappa)} \bar{u}_\kappa(x), \tag{A.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\widetilde{u}_\kappa(x) &= \frac{r_\kappa \nabla\eta(x_\kappa + r_\kappa x)}{\eta(x_\kappa)} \bar{u}_\kappa(x) + \frac{\eta(x_\kappa + r_\kappa x)}{\eta(x_\kappa)} \nabla\bar{u}_\kappa(x) \\ &= L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha} u_\kappa(x_\kappa + r_\kappa x) \nabla\eta(x_\kappa + r_\kappa x) + \frac{\eta(x_\kappa + r_\kappa x)}{\eta(x_\kappa)} \nabla\bar{u}_\kappa(x) \\ &= \frac{\eta(x_\kappa + r_\kappa x)}{\eta(x_\kappa)} \nabla\bar{u}_\kappa(x) + O(L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha}). \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

These relations also hold for $\widetilde{v}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$.

By (A.2), we have

$$1 = \frac{|\widetilde{u}_\kappa(0) - \widetilde{u}_\kappa(z_\kappa)| + |\widetilde{v}_\kappa(0) - \widetilde{v}_\kappa(z_\kappa)|}{|z_\kappa|^\alpha} = \max_{x,y\in\Omega_\kappa} \frac{|\widetilde{u}_\kappa(x) - \widetilde{u}_\kappa(y)| + |\widetilde{v}_\kappa(x) - \widetilde{v}_\kappa(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha}. \tag{A.5}$$

Here $z_\kappa = \frac{y_\kappa - x_\kappa}{r_\kappa}$.

Next, because η is Lipschitz continuous in $\overline{B_2(0)}$, for $x \in \Omega_\kappa$, we have a constant C which depends only on $\sup_{B_2(0)}(u_\kappa + v_\kappa)$ and the Lipschitz constant of η, such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\widetilde{u}_\kappa(x) - \bar{u}_\kappa(x)| + |\widetilde{v}_\kappa(x) - \bar{v}_\kappa(x)| &\le \frac{C}{L_\kappa r_\kappa^\alpha} |\eta(x_\kappa + r_\kappa x) - \eta(x_\kappa)| \\ &\le C L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha} |x|, \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

which goes to 0 uniformly on any compact set as $\kappa \to +\infty$. Finally, we note that $(\bar{u}_\kappa, \bar{v}_\kappa)$ satisfies (1.3) with the parameter $\kappa L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{2-\alpha} \eta(x_\kappa)^{-2}$. Denote this constant by M_κ. By the Lipschitz continuity of η, we also have

$$\widetilde{u}_\kappa(x) + \widetilde{v}_\kappa(x) \le C L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha} \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega_\kappa). \tag{A.7}$$

The next three lemmas correspond to Lemma 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 in [12] respectively.

Lemma A.1. *If there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $M_\kappa \ge \frac{1}{C}$ and $\frac{|x_\kappa - y_\kappa|}{r_\kappa} \le C$, then $\widetilde{u}_\kappa(0) + \widetilde{v}_\kappa(0)$ is uniformly bounded.*

Proof. Assume under the assumptions in this lemma, we have

$$A_\kappa := \widetilde{u}_\kappa(0) = \bar{u}_\kappa(0) \to +\infty.$$

By (A.7),

$$\mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_\kappa) \ge C L_\kappa r_\kappa^{-1+\alpha} A_\kappa, \tag{A.8}$$

which goes to $+\infty$ as $\kappa \to +\infty$. Hence, for any $R > 0$, if κ is sufficiently large, by (A.5) we have

$$\widetilde{u}_\kappa(x) \ge A_\kappa - 2R^\alpha, \quad \text{in} \quad B_{2R}(0).$$

By (A.6), for fixed R, if κ is sufficiently large, we have

$$\bar{u}_\kappa(x) \ge A_\kappa - 2R^\alpha - CL_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha} R \ge \frac{A_\kappa}{2}, \quad \text{in} \quad B_{2R}(0).$$

Hence

$$\Delta \bar{v}_\kappa \ge C M_\kappa A_\kappa^2 \bar{v}_\kappa \quad \text{in} \quad B_{2R}(0).$$

By (A.5) and Lemma 2.5, we get

$$\sup_{B_R(0)} \bar{v}_\kappa \le C\Big(\sup_{B_R(0)} \bar{v}_\kappa + R^\alpha + CL_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha} R\Big) e^{-\frac{1}{C} R M_\kappa^{1/2} A_\kappa}.$$

This implies

$$\sup_{B_R(0)} \bar{v}_\kappa \le C R e^{-\frac{1}{C} R M_\kappa^{1/2} A_\kappa}.$$

Substituting this into the equations of $\bar{u}_\kappa$ and $\bar{v}_\kappa$, we see

$$\sup_{B_R(0)} (\Delta \bar{u}_\kappa + \Delta \bar{v}_\kappa) \to 0.$$

By standard elliptic estimates combined with (A.5) and (A.6), we obtain

$$\sup_{B_{R-1}(0)} (|\nabla \bar{u}_\kappa| + |\nabla \bar{v}_\kappa|) \le C(R),$$

where $C(R)$ depends only on R. Note that (A.8) implies

$$\operatorname{dist}(x_\kappa, \partial B_2(0)) \gg r_\kappa.$$

In particular, $y_\kappa \in B_{\operatorname{dist}(x_\kappa, \partial B_2(0))/2}(x_\kappa)$. Then by combining (A.1) with (A.4), we get for another constant $C(R)$,

$$\sup_{B_{R-1}(0)} (|\nabla \widetilde{u}_\kappa| + |\nabla \widetilde{v}_\kappa|) \le C(R).$$

By our assumption, we can take R large so that $|z_\kappa| \le R$ for all $\kappa > 0$. Substituting the above estimate into (A.5), we see

$$1 = \frac{|\widetilde{u}_\kappa(0) - \widetilde{u}_\kappa(z_\kappa)| + |\widetilde{v}_\kappa(0) - \widetilde{v}_\kappa(z_\kappa)|}{|z_\kappa|^\alpha} \le C(R)|z_\kappa|^{1-\alpha},$$

which implies a uniform lower bound of $|z_\kappa|$. Then arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [12], we can get a contradiction and finish the proof. $\square$

Lemma A.2. *$\kappa L_\kappa^{-1}|x_\kappa - y_\kappa|^{2-\alpha}\eta(x_\kappa)^{-2} \to +\infty$.*

Proof. By contradiction, assume that $\kappa L_\kappa^{-1}|x_\kappa - y_\kappa|^{2-\alpha}\eta(x_\kappa)^{-2}$ is bounded. Take r_κ so that

$$\kappa L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{2-\alpha}\eta(x_\kappa)^{-2} = 1.$$

By this choice, the assumptions of the previous lemma are satisfied. Hence $\{\widetilde{u}_\kappa(0)\}, \{\widetilde{v}_\kappa(0)\}$ are bounded. By (A.5) and the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem, up to a subsequence, there exist u_∞, v_∞ such that $\widetilde{u}_\kappa \to u_\infty$, $\widetilde{v}_\kappa \to v_\infty$ uniformly on any compact set of Ω_∞. By (A.6), $\bar{u}_\kappa \to u_\infty$, $\bar{v}_\kappa \to v_\infty$ uniformly on any compact set of Ω_∞, too. Moreover, since $(\bar{u}_\kappa, \bar{v}_\kappa)$ is defined in $B_{r_\kappa^{-1}}(0)$ and satisfies (1.3) with parameter 1, for any $R > 0$,

$$\sup_{B_R(0)} \left(|\nabla \bar{u}_\kappa| + |\nabla \bar{v}_\kappa|\right) \le C(R). \tag{A.9}$$

If $\mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_\kappa) \to +\infty$ (i.e. Ω_∞ is the entire space), we can argue as in the previous lemma to deduce that

$$\sup_{B_R(0)} \left(|\nabla \widetilde{u}_\kappa| + |\nabla \widetilde{v}_\kappa|\right) \le C(R).$$

which, as before, implies a uniform lower bound of $|z_\kappa|$. Then the following proof is exactly the same as in the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [12].

Next we consider the case when Ω_∞ is a half-space, that is, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_\kappa) \le C.$$

We still need a uniform lower bound of $|z_\kappa|$ as above. Assume by contrary that $|z_\kappa| \to 0$. Then by (A.2) and (A.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|z_\kappa|^\alpha &= |\widetilde{u}_\kappa(0) - \widetilde{u}_\kappa(z_\kappa)| + |\widetilde{v}_\kappa(0) - \widetilde{v}_\kappa(z_\kappa)| \\
&\le C L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha} \left(\mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_\kappa) + \mathrm{dist}(z_\kappa, \partial\Omega_\kappa)\right) \\
&\le C L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha} \left(\mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_\kappa) + |z_\kappa|\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|z_\kappa| \to 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, this implies

$$|z_\kappa| \le C L_\kappa^{-1} r_\kappa^{1-\alpha} \mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_\kappa) < \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\Omega_\kappa).$$

Arguing as before and using (A.9) and (A.4), we can get

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{\mathrm{dist}(0,\partial\Omega_\kappa)}{2}}(0)} \left(|\nabla \widetilde{u}_\kappa| + |\nabla \widetilde{v}_\kappa|\right) \le C.$$

Then exactly as in the previous lemma, we get a constant $c > 0$ such that $|z_\kappa| \ge c$ for all κ. So in any case, we must have a uniform lower bound for $|z_\kappa|$. Combing this with (A.5) and (A.7), we get a contradiction directly in this case. □

Lemma A.3. *Let $r_\kappa = |x_\kappa - y_\kappa|$. Then there exist u_∞, $v_\infty \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\bar{u}_\kappa \to u_\infty$, $\bar{v}_\kappa \to v_\infty$ uniformly on any compact set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The limit satisfies $u_\infty v_\infty \equiv 0$.*

Proof. By the previous lemma, we must have

$$M_\kappa = \kappa L_\kappa^{-1} |x_\kappa - y_\kappa|^{2-\alpha} \eta(x_\kappa)^{-2} \to +\infty.$$

Hence if we choose $r_\kappa = |x_\kappa - y_\kappa|$, $\{\widetilde{u}_\kappa(0)\}, \{\widetilde{v}_\kappa(0)\}$ are bounded. As before, when Ω_∞ is a half-space, combing (A.5) and (A.7) we can get a contradiction directly. So Ω_∞ must be the entire space $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then as in the previous lemma, there exist u_∞, $v_\infty \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\bar{u}_\kappa \to u_\infty$, $\bar{v}_\kappa \to v_\infty$ uniformly on any compact set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then we can follow the proof of Lemma 3.6 in [12] to get the claim. □

Using the Liouville type results in [12] together with the above three lemmas, we know (A.2) can not be true. So $\hat{u}_\kappa$ and $\hat{v}_\kappa$ are uniformly bounded in $C^\alpha(B_2(0))$. Since $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B_1(0)$, it is easily seen that u_κ and v_κ are uniformly bounded in $C^\alpha(B_1(0))$, for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.6.

Remark A.4. *We can allow some additional terms in the right hand side of equations in (1.3) as in [12]. Theorem 2.6 can also be generalized to the case with more than two equations, and to the case of parabolic equations (corresponding to the main result in [7]). This method can also be applied to obtain a local estimate near boundary if the boundary and boundary values are sufficiently smooth.*

References

[1] H.W. Alt, L.A. Caffarelli and A. Friedman, Variational problems with two phases and their free boundaries. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 282 (1984), no.2, 431-461.

[2] H. Berestycki, F. Hamel and R. Monneau, One dimensional symmetry of bounded entire solutions of some elliptic equations, Duke Math. J. 103(2000), no.3, 375-396.

[3] H. Berestycki, T. C. Lin, J. C. Wei and C. Zhao, On phase-separation model: asymptotics and qualitative properties, preprint 2009.

[4] H. Berestycki, S. Terracini, K. Wang and J. C. Wei, Existence and stability of entire solutions of an elliptic system modeling phase separation, preprint.

[5] L. A. Caffarelli and F. Lin, Singularly perturbed elliptic systems and multi-valued harmonic functions with free boundaries, Journal of the American Mathematical Society 21(2008), 847-862.

[6] M. Conti, S. Terracini and G. Verzini, Asymptotic estimates for the spatial segregation of competitive systems, Adv. Math. 195 (2005), no. 2, 524-560.

[7] E. N. Dancer, K. Wang and Z. Zhang, Uniform Hölder estimate for singularly perturbed parabolic systems of Bose-Einstein condensates and competing species, Journal of Differential Equations, 251 (2011) 2737-2769.

[8] E.N. Dancer, K. Wang and Z. Zhang, The limit equation for the Gross-Pitaevskii equations and S. Terracini's conjecture, Journal of Functional Analysis, 262 (2012), no. 2, 1087-1131.

[9] S. Friedland and W. K. Hayman, Eigenvalue inequalities for the Dirichlet problem on spheres and the growth of subharmonic functions, Comm. Math. Helv. 51 (1979), 133-161.

[10] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Sprigner.

[11] B. Helffer, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof and S. Terracini, On Spectral Minimal Partitions: the Case of the Sphere, Around the Research of Vladimir Maz'ya III, International Mathematical Series, Springer New York 2010, Volume 13, 153-178.

[12] B. Noris, H. Tavares, S. Terracini and G. Verzini, Uniform Hölder bounds for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with strong competition. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 63(2010), no. 3, 267-302.

[13] O. Savin, Regularity of flat level sets in phase transitions, Annals of Mathematics, 169(2009), 41-78.

[14] H. Tavares and S. Terracini, Regularity of the nodal set of segregated critical configurations under a weak reflection law, *Calc. Var.*, to appear (http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00526-011-0458-z).